

**MADISON RIVER NEGOTIATED RULE MAKING COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES FROM MARCH 25, 2019**

RECORDING STARTED SHORTLY BEFORE LAST BREAK OF THE DAY

Mike Mitchell: You've proposed an alternative solution, an alternative to (unintelligible) the April rule. Where do you start? How do you construct that alternative? That's totally up to you.

Tim Aldrich: That's the first decision, decide where you start in my opinion.

Mike Mitchell: However you come up with the alternative, it really, really doesn't matter at this point. You could base them on the April rule, you can say I'm pitching the April rule, I'm starting from scratch. The thing is if you were to imagine what the group is supposed to report back to FWP and to the Commission, what alternative, what thing can you imagine the group would report out that it would feel comfortable saying well here's why we don't do the status quo in the April rule. Here's why it's better. That's what the alternatives are.

Don Skaar: So is each group just going to come up with one?

Mike Mitchell: No

Don Skaar: Oh

Mike Mitchell: No, I want each group to capture different alternatives because you're going to have different people in your group. I don't want the groups to argue about one, which is the best one. I want groups to capture the different alternatives based on the different perspectives in the group.

Don Skaar: Would you rather us modify what's there or just throw in new ones entirely?

Mike Mitchell: Whatever you want.

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Yeah, well I mean so, you went through an exercise already of coming up with alternatives, this might have told you some things about well okay here's how I can do it better, here's how I can do it differently. So here's your chance and come up with whatever you want that you can imagine the group getting behind and form a consensus. This is what the group could report out. You're not presupposing what the group is going to do. We're going to let the decision analysis sort through that. But come up with different ways that the group might solve the problem based on different perspectives.

Tim Aldrich: So we got two of us in totally disagree on where we're going with this thing, so I say no I on the AA this moves in the direction that (unintelligible) needs to go (unintelligible).

Mike Mitchell: That's two alternatives.

Michael Bias: We're just redoing what we did last time.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mike Mitchell: Hopefully doing it better.

Michael Bias: New alternatives are based on some of the stuff we did.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah, so hopefully you've learned about the whole process of comparing alternatives to objectives, how we're going to be able to evaluate the alternatives. These were just drafts so now's the time to come up with some that you, you know, this is what I really seriously want to evaluate and we need a diversity just like this. If we don't have a diversity we really can't make the decision so I'm asking each small group to come up with a diversity. Yeah.

Mark Odegard: It probably would be useful to have a maybe a hard copy of that.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mike Mitchell: Of that?

Julie Eaton: Yes please.

Mark Odegard: Yeah

Scott Vollmer: We're going to use this for the form and talk about it correct? The way it scores here.

Mike Mitchell: No again I wouldn't take those scores seriously.

Jim Slattery: I think he just wants you to come up with new alternatives.

Mike Mitchell: This is just to illustrate. This is not to guide.

Julie Eaton: I still would like it.

Mike Mitchell: What's that?

Julie Eaton: I still would like it.

Mike Mitchell: Well so here's the one thing I'd be concerned about doing it. I don't want people anchoring on these.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: We're already anchored man.

Mike Mitchell: Well okay let me say don't anchor on these.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: You have learned from this process so let's go forward based on what you've learned without saying I need to use these numbers at all.

Julie Eaton: Why don't you just take them off the screen?

Mike Mitchell: I will take them off the screen.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: No not yet (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: The thing is that it seemed, the green things seem to point us toward something that's useful

Jim Slattery: That's true.

Mike Mitchell: Uh huh.

Mark Odegard: and the red things point us toward something that's not useful.

Mike Mitchell: Uh huh.

Mark Odegard: So it would be helpful to know what's useful and what isn't.

Tim Aldrich: We're going to each have a block we can represent us so ideally if we I'm sorry I like alternative one, where I want to go and on and on and on, and someplace, no I, it ought to be where I am forward that appears so anyway I think I understand what this is going to be.

Don Skaar: Toward that end I'd be interested in some feedback from the group with regard to the real low scores on the accessibility there, I mean

Julie Eaton: It's wade only.

Don Skaar: On the a

Julie Eaton: It's closures

Don Skaar: I mean line 13

Julie Eaton: closed it.

Don Skaar: I mean if our goal is to try to make sure we get an alternative where that's

Mike Mitchell: That's not your goal.

Don Skaar: It isn't?

Mike Mitchell: That is not your goal.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: That's why I don't want these numbers. Your goal is to come up with a draft of the rule, several different drafts of the rule a group might propose and let's see how they play out. This does not represent how those alternatives will play out.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: Oh

Charlotte Cleveland: Just forget that, just forget that.

Don Skaar: I guess I just wanted to understand what they, what types of users are being envisioned as having accessibility problems.

Mike Mitchell: I think that's something to think about and talk about in your group but again you're not trying to design a silver bullet solution. You're trying to capture the diversity of possible solutions the group should consider that all members of the group feel they should consider.

Melissa Glaser: How do you view this as different than the last time we broke into groups? Like how is this the like 2.0 version of this?

Mike Mitchell: It may not be, it may be the stuff you came up with last time as I'm good. I'm done alright? Fine. If it's not though it's like well okay I've thought about it, I've seen this, there's some things I'd like to tweak or some other things that I think we should consider.

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Then there you go.

Tim Aldrich: I think like that one objective by itself and not have to mix it will all 37 of them and then you can get pretty clean with that objective.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah but, you know, you're not trying to maximize every objective at this point so if you think about just what does it take to maximize this objective put that in alternative. What does it take to maximize this one. That silver bullet almost certainly doesn't exist out there but you really don't know, it's really hard to have that discussion without having this up there to guide you. So it's like alright this, it's doing pretty poorly on this objective alright otherwise maybe I like that alternative so what can we do there but that's when you talk about tweaking a single objective. You don't go objective by objective by objective okay? You come up with solutions that make sense. This might be a good way to do it. Let's see how it scores out and then we can tweak the good way to do it. Questions? This is where the rubber meets the road. This is where the group deliberates over different ways of solving this problem. This is where you creatively come up with here's a solution, here's a solution, here's a solution. Let's consider them all alright and then we'll talk about how they all rank out. Break up? So 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, 1, so we got three groups, let's do group 1 over here, 2 back there somewhere, group 3 over there. And I'd like to, okay it's actually break time do you guys want to take a break?

COMMITTEE SAYING YES

Mike Mitchell: And then we'll get back together at 10:30.

COMMITTEE ON BREAK

Mike Mitchell: Everybody had a chance to look them over pretty well or you want more time?

Julie Eaton: Is there a group that still has the Iron Ranger in there? I'm not seeing it so I'm thinking no but I could be missing it. Did it go away?

Michael Bias: I was using that to try to evaluate (unintelligible) users.

Julie Eaton: But you took it out?

Michael Bias: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Folks ready to discuss or do you want some more time? Does anybody have any questions to clarify something they're not sure about in an alternative? Julie

Julie Eaton: This is again a similar question as we're all really happy about our five dollar stamps and all that, how long does it take, what is the process for this money not to just go into general fund and then have to piece it out and then someone else not grab it?

Don Skaar: Yeah, it would be a legislative thing

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: That would be kind of tough thing to

Julie Eaton: Exactly

Don Skaar: pass that and then not have it approved by the Legislature.

Julie Eaton: Right I mean what is, in the ideal world which nobody lives in, what's the best way to make sure that things get earmarked to a specific budget?

Don Skaar: Well again that's pretty hard to get through the Legislature

Julie Eaton: Yeah, okay

Don Skaar: I mean the way we've dealt with it in the real world and I mean an example is the SRP permittees, you know we, well that's probably not the best example I mean through our normal funding authorization you can see then what's budgeted and where the money does go so even though it's not earmarked there's still a trail there through the budgeting process that'll show that there would be an equivalent amount of money spent on this activity that you raised the money for so that's about the only way you could do that if it wasn't a guaranteed earmark.

Julie Eaton: Because it does, it sounds wonderful but I think the general fund is hard to get away from.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Yeah that's my point yeah

Don Skaar: If we bought in, if the Commission voted for it and it was all approved and we didn't get an earmark through the Legislature, we'd put in our budget request for that amount of money in that fund and just coming out of the general license account.

Julie Eaton: And then we could hold off, I mean could we say I don't want to start a program that we, before we know if we have the funding. That if it gets approved then we can institute this part of (unintelligible) people different plan is that how it would work? Try it first and then it kicks in?

Don Skaar: I mean, making this, I don't think I'd make this essential part of the, if we didn't get it hopefully there's other aspects of this alternative that are compelling, I mean it's not all just based on the money for the enforcement.

Julie Eaton: But it's a significant amount what we, if you do the numbers and people are hoping to add employees, which again I think those are, those are longshots in my understanding.

Don Skaar: Yeah, Eileen you want to

Eileen Ryce: Yeah, let me take it

Don Skaar: offer an opinion on that?

Eileen Ryce: I'll save a Don a little bit before he gets us in too much trouble. First of all on the earmarked thing we can't earmark money. That's not going to happen however earmarks that are in place are grandfathered in but there's diversion issues and we've been told we can't do earmarks. However, what I would say is this wouldn't be any different than any of our other programs. If something gets implemented either through the legislative session or through the Commission our jobs are to carry through with that implementation. It could be that I would have to divert resources from somewhere else to put into it. We can do that. What Don's talking about with the allocation is with any license revenue that we bring in it goes into that general license account. How we designate that for a particular programs, we go through the Legislative session and ask for an increase in our authority of spending for a particular program and that's how we also get FTE. But what I would recommend for the group is not to worry too much about those details, that's more for us to figure out how we implement what it is that you come up with. The funding revenue source you know the staff and the implementation, that's more for us.

Julie Eaton: I guess it's kind of like a hind sight cautionary tale. The CAC had some great ideas and then go sorry we don't have the funding so I just want to remind ourselves that we can't put our eggs to much in that basket.

Eileen Ryce: Well and the other think I would mention just because I feel like I have to put it into context, Fisheries in general is highly subsidized from non-resident elk

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Eileen Ryce: No from non-resident elk licenses. That's what supports the majority of our programs. We don't bring in as much license dollars as we spend. (unintelligible) is actually declining. We are actually spending more license dollars (unintelligible) but that's been a recent switch if my budget passes tomorrow but (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Sorry to bring up that sad thing.

Eileen Ryce: So, I don't know if that helps.

Don Skaar: But still I think, my understanding the ingredients of some of these alternatives, having that presence out on the river is important to implement it so

Julie Eaton: Absolutely

Don Skaar: So I think we should continue to

Julie Eaton: Okay

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Eileen Ryce: But my point was you don't need to worry about how I'm going to figure out how I'm paying for it or where the FTE is coming from. Obviously I'm not going to give you another 25 FTE for the Madison but sorry. We could divert Travis's position.

Mike Mitchell: Other clarified questions?

Michael Bias: I have a question. I think this goes to Jim. (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Mike can you speak up we can barely (unintelligible).

Michael Bias: Yeah, first page group 1 alternative 1, new rule, (unintelligible) to one fish, is that an (unintelligible) or is that fish regs?

Jim Slattery: We're talking about social impacts and with the increased pressure at five fish is the current largest limit impacting the fishery I would think. So it's kind of outside our scope on this (unintelligible) it has to do with over or increasing of the pressure and protecting the river so it could be at least a recommendation.

Don Skaar: My thought on that is that would probably get put through our regulation, fish regulation process and that again has its own dynamic and so we couldn't promise how that would come through that.

Jim Slattery: Right

Michael Bias: Or let me ask in a different way Travis is here, if we implement that is that, I mean if that's one of our recommendations does that get thrown out or is that only implemented through you guys, through fish (unintelligible).

Travis Horton: Yeah we have to put it through a process so if this was a plan we could offer it as a suggestion to the Commission for public comment (unintelligible) the process.

Don Skaar: But I think if this was the plan that we recommend the Commission, the Commission put it out and wanted it then that would be, that would then go in the fishing reg packages that

Michael Bias: Right

Don Skaar: as a preferred change

Michael Bias: Right

Don Skaar: So it would probably happen.

Michael Bias: Okay

Don Skaar: It would just probably take a little extra, another extra step.

Michael Bias: Right

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible) the process like that, four year cycle of fishing regulations that's what's supposed to be used to make it these adjustments unless it's an emergency (unintelligible).

Eileen Ryce: Yeah we're just starting the (unintelligible) year this year so but, we need to keep the recreation rules separate from the regulations but what the Committee could do is make a recommendation to the regulation process. I don't know if Travis has his Spring scoping meeting set up yet but all the Regions will be scheduling their scoping meetings so that's the first opportunity. The package like Don spoke about is scheduled to go to the Commission in August.

Michael Bias: Okay

Eileen Ryce: So between now and then if there was a recommendation that came in we would include it with everything else.

Scott Vollmer: That includes Hebgen as well I presume?

Jim Slattery: Well just for the Madison River but I would sure like it to be for Hebgen to Quake.

Scott Vollmer: I'm fine with that too. I don't have a problem with catch and release.

Jim Slattery: I mean especially now with the lakes not being (unintelligible) or Hebgen not being (unintelligible).

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible) I don't know if I'm reading this right (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: It says Yellowstone National Park boundary to Hebgen

Jim Slattery: to Hebgen yeah, five Browns

Melissa Glaser: catch and release for Rainbow Trout

Jim Slattery: Yep or five Browns

Melissa Glaser: Okay so you're talking specific to Brown

Jim Slattery: (unintelligible) probably know that. I tried

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Travis Horton: I tried to go simple (unintelligible) got crucified, oh my god you won't let somebody kill the fish, but again people didn't realize (unintelligible) reduction in the whole thing and jimmied part of this.

Melissa Glaser: So that's specific Brown Trout.

Jim Slattery: Exactly.

Mike Mitchell: So I want to make sure capture what Scott and Jim are talking about modifying this.

Scott Vollmer: I don't know this is Jim's I don't want to.

Michael Bias: So that would be Brown Trout

Scott Vollmer: I'm just clarifying

Michael Bias: not catch and release Rainbows in there.

Jim Slattery: Yeah. One Brown Trout would be fine from Hebgen up to the Park.

Mike Mitchell: You want to make a modification?

Jim Slattery: I think that, no I think that if FWP sees that and they agree with it they'll, they already have a no limit, I mean a no harvest on Rainbows, they'd just lower the Browns to one.

Tim Aldrich: I don't think it should be in the rule I think (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: Okay other clarifying questions?

Don Skaar: Yeah on alternative 2 right down below that there, on the triggers for the declining the fishery, the problem with that I see just from the Department's standpoint is that's identified a real issue but that's kind of our day job is to look for impacts to the fishery and it's hard to know what that's going to be in advance what that would even look like so I would hesitate to know what the solution is going to be since we don't know what the problem would be. The fix for the particular decline the fishery may not be user days, maybe it would be, I don't know maybe it would be closing it down entirely to fishing. I think when you don't know what the problem might be with a fishery it's hard to program in a solution in advance. I'm not discounting that as an issue I'm just not sure that it would really work to identify a fix right now. Maybe there's a way to still work that in there but not have that hard wired.

Scott Vollmer: You're looking at me Don, that's not mine.

Don Skaar: Oh, okay. I thought it was.

Mark Odegard: That's mine.

Don Skaar: Okay

Mark Odegard: I have not seen anything that says we have a real problem, fisheries apparently is pretty stable. We're getting a lot more people and some people have complained but and some people are moving but I think that's kind of normal for people like me who've fished all over the country. I fished where you have shoulder to shoulder people almost, we don't have that. It's getting crowded but I don't know what the trigger is for when it's too crowded.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mark Odegard: I know when the triggers is for the fishery is when it declines by 25% I'd start worrying.

Scott Vollmer: And that's similar to what I said in mine is you get you know Travis and Dave I'm sure know exactly what a good healthy historic levels are (unintelligible). I know they know that. I shouldn't say probably I know they know that. And they also I'm sure know what a prescribed level would be of decline and it's incredibly, not even incredibly alarming, it's alarming and I would personally want to look to them to have those prescriptions set in place. I don't want to do it myself because that's not my area of expertise and once you hit those areas of prescription and I know there's a little lag time there I'm fully aware of that. Once you hit those levels of prescription that's when you look to do something and do something immediately. And that's not a level that this fishery is declined to the point where it is, you know whirling disease really, really we're not in a good place, it's much, much higher than that. It's a certain level below those historic levels of good stock assessment data of quality fishery we could look at Travis and Dave and everyone else at FWP to prescribe for us. I'm sure they could do that very easily. I'm assuming that.

Travis Horton: Like I said the first couple of days here we've never studied such a thing. Nobody (unintelligible) a Brown Trout fishery that has 200,000 plus angler days a year and what the tipping point may or may not be we have no idea And we don't even know if it crosses a tipping point, would it be a slow decline or a rapid decline. I can't really say. I mean I could tell you yeah if it goes down by 10% we should probably do something but I could have them go from 150.

Scott Vollmer: I agree with you its conjecture and it's simply conjecture to say what those declines are cause for. What I'm saying is let's not focus on the conjecture, let's focus on what

the numbers are, the biology's telling us, when drops happen let's do something about it immediately.

Tim Aldrich: Travis's would be a lot like that upper Missouri River Reservoir plan triggers that are in there, the three year averages that fuel the point where we're at. There is something (unintelligible) where you got two types of fish you got to manage for and two (unintelligible) situation.

Mike Mitchell: So Scott is the trigger idea, triggers idea in your alternative that goes back in alternative 5?

Scott Vollmer: Yep, yeah it's in mine.

Mike Mitchell: Okay. Mike

Michael Bias: Continuing on the triggers (unintelligible) and I'm glad Travis is here, should that even be in our plan because you guys are going to implement I don't even want to say it but (unintelligible) hit the Madison like it did the Yellowstone last year you guys are going to implement management restrictions and closures regardless of what our SRP plan says or the (unintelligible) plan says so for us to deal with social conflict issue and implement or intergrade biological triggers for (unintelligible) modification of restrictions in our plan further might be outside the purview of this because you're going to implement regardless.

Travis Horton: There would be actions take place pretty quickly.

Michael Bias: Yeah, I don't know.

Julie Eaton: I mean is there something that, we're not the biologists, I mean obviously we (unintelligible) the health of the fishery are there somethings that you'd like us to look out for in this plan or just say you'll tell us (unintelligible) if you do.

Travis Horton: I almost hear like two different approaches I (unintelligible) until something happens or others may be more conservative and that's up to this Committee to recommend something.

Julie Eaton: Well yeah, that's different than a final objective.

Travis Horton: I mean there's concern and not concern about the fishery, and there's two approaches we'd talk about.

Scott Vollmer: I think Tim and I we talked about that a little, we kind of talked about that at the end is in no way whatsoever was I suggesting keep the peddle to the floor whatsoever. One thing we talked about in what I have in that alternative is for the user stamp education be involved with it too and not only education is I think how I put it to you was is you have users that have to jump through a little bit of hoops in order to get your permit or your stamp, you have

to take, kind of go through a little video on line or something like that. That's cumbersome, you don't want to make it incredibly cumbersome but it's a little cumbersome and because of that we all know that there's going to be a lot of people that say ah, you know what, I don't think I'm going to fish the Madison this year. Which produces other problems with displacement for sure, I'm fully aware, but the education component to me is very big. I'd love to have that where we can very easily make some people aware how their actions, how they should act on a river and I think that's really, really important. And I think there are certain amount of users that if you make them go through the steps and jump through the hoops to get that education they'll say I really don't want to do it or pay the money for that matter and that is going to reduce the amount of angler days on the river. If you combine that with a period of review that's very, very short like two years or so, you combine that it also requires the users to give us the data of how many days they fished and

Mike Mitchell: Scott (unintelligible) let's not advocate a particular (unintelligible) right now.

Scott Vollmer: I apologize.

Mike Mitchell: Any other clarifying questions? Mike

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) the last page (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Yes, or move them or (unintelligible), whatever day or time, figure out what that means.

Don Skaar: I got a question on the last page too on alternative 3 first thing under there. Establish carrying capacity for angler days, what's envisioned there?

Julie Eaton: It's not supposed to be there actually it was at the top, yeah, thank you for pointing that out.

Mike Mitchell: Sorry.

Julie Eaton: No that's, don't even

Don Skaar: Is that

Julie Eaton: Take it out

Don Skaar: Oh

Julie Eaton: It's addressed below there.

Melissa Glaser: What about on capping non-commercial days?

Julie Eaton: It could be a lot of different things, we decide who, what, and where, and how many based on a year or not on river users.

Mark Odegard: Question, isn't there a survey being done this year an odd year?

Don Skaar: Starting this March, yep, starting this month

Mark Odegard: We should use 2019

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: No, mail.

Julie Eaton: Mail

Mark Odegard: Sounds like 2019 should be on the page here.

Mike Mitchell: (unintelligible) request? So folks want to reevaluate these eight, Julie did I count that right?

Julie Eaton: Yeah eight plus our nothing in April

Mike Mitchell: Okay, Lauren do you want to evaluate these? Is anybody not seeing a stake holders perspective in the alternatives that we found?

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Okay that's fine, for now.

Julie Eaton: For now.

Mike Mitchell: Any glaring omissions or have we got the stake holders (unintelligible) in our alternatives as far as you can tell? Okay, so this is what we need to do. (unintelligible)

SOMEONE COUGHING MAKING IT VERY HARD TO HEAR

Mike Mitchell: So tonight homework, we're going to send you the alternatives that you want to evaluate, we'll send you a spread sheet that includes those and then we're going to ask each of you to go ahead and fill out the consequences table. These are, the scores that you originally put in for status quo in the April rule, they're going to be in there if you want to change them by all means change them. We're just trying to save you a little time and effort. One thing, a couple things I'm going to want you to think about while you're doing this, we're going to use the same one to five scale, score, for tonight. While you're doing it if you think there's a way of scoring it out using data, using whatever that would be better than a one to five score then come in prepared to talk about that tomorrow. And then the other thing is you're going to learn about the alternatives while you score these out. So some of these it might just be really similar and not make much of a difference alone, we'll be able to say yeah okay, pretty

much the same thing. But if again you get to this point where you see a glaring omission in an alternative critical stake holder perspective is not represented. Who out there is going to say you didn't think about what I think? So granted we can't necessarily have an alternative for left handed fishermen from Delaware, nothing against left handed fishermen from Delaware, but for the people that have been really involved in this decision (unintelligible) have we got an alternative that reflects their perspective. Questions on that? Make sense what we're looking for?

Melissa Glaser: What you said about using the one to five scale and if we have data to go along with that are you just saying why (unintelligible) or something in that data

Mike Mitchell: Yeah you can do it either way so an example would be for like the Lion Structured Decision Making Process we had a population model that would say okay if you followed this alternative that's how many lions would be left. May not have anything like that right now, another thing that you can do is you can take historical data and draw a trim line through it and say alright well if we implemented this alternative here's what's likely to happen to the trim line. Now that's forecasting and that's, you know, you're assuming that what's happened in the past tells you something about the future but it may still be better than one to five. That's going to be, that's your call. As you're going through and you say one to five, no I think we could do better just bring that in there. Okay? Questions?

Sarah Sells: You guys are going to see 1 through 8 so just renumber (unintelligible), send out electronic version of 1 through 8 (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Yeah, so in the handout you will know which one is number 1, number 2, number 3, okay?

Don Skaar: (unintelligible) the handout that will be sent along

Mike Mitchell: Yes, in what we'll send you.

Don Skaar: Okay

Jim Slattery: I'm going to need printed copies of this.

Mike Mitchell: Okay, is there anybody else that doesn't have a lap top? If we can actually enter these into the spreadsheet without writing down, not naming any names, Don, so I'll lend you my laptop.

Jim Slattery: Okay

Mike Mitchell: so that you can do that.

Jim Slattery: If you want to do that or I can write the numbers down and (unintelligible).

Mike Mitchell: Yeah but then she's got to enter them, and you want to stay on her good side.

Jim Slattery: All right.

Sarah Sells: It's going to be too many numbers (unintelligible) a person (unintelligible) but the other option would be do it by hand and then fill it in, in the morning.

Jim Slattery: Yeah, well if you want to lend me your computer.

Mike Mitchell: I'll do it.

Jim Slattery: Okay.

Mike Mitchell: Everybody else good to go on that?

Don Skaar: You didn't have?

(unintelligible)

Don Skaar: Oh okay.

Mike Mitchell: Julie you're chewing on something I can see it.

Julie Eaton: No I, I, I'm there.

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Julie Eaton: I wasn't but now I am.

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Jim Slattery: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: What's that?

Jim Slattery: I only have desktops.

Mike Mitchell: Oh, okay

Jim Slattery: I have like four of them.

(unintelligible)

Sarah Sells: Do you guys want me to put each of your spreadsheets, your status quo, and April rule originals (unintelligible) or this blank one and then just fill in the rest? Do you have those scores?

(unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Is that what you did?

Sarah Sells: I can make you each one of these separate.

Julie Eaton: It sounds like a lot is that a lot?

(unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Well you decide.

Mike Mitchell: they can do that, we'll put your old scores for the status quo and the April rule in there so you can look them over and decide what you want to do with them but you don't have to duplicate effort if you don't want to. Questions?

Sarah Sells: Do you want them to send it tonight or when they get done?

Mike Mitchell: Yes

Sarah Sells: Send it to me whenever you get done.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah that would be great and again as you saw this morning there's some work that needs to be done to pull them all together into a single analysis but we're going to do the same sort of thing. You're going to see the results across the group and then we can start talking about these different tradeoffs support for the different alternatives, what do we like, what do we dislike, what does the data support, what does the data not support, other ideas we need to come up with, the whole shooting match. What I hope to do is spend most of the day tomorrow in that discussion because this is the discussion that everyone's been wanting to have all along, totally understand, but it will be informed by the decision analysis and where you go from there as a group will be up to you. But that's what the discussion will be about. Does that make sense? Okay. We're at 4:20 for the record 10 minutes early. That is some kind of record. Eileen how would you prefer, you want to go straight in to public comment or do you want to wait until 4:30?

Eileen Ryce: We can start public comment now.

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Eileen Ryce: We'll just do public comment like we have at the other meeting, (unintelligible) before can I just get a show of hands who's interested in giving public comment so we have an idea? So it's 5 or 6? Mark's going to be the time keeper we'll limit everyone to about 3 or 4 minutes. What we'll do is we have the tape recorder going, we'll have everyone come up here and stand here and face the Committee. Just as usual state your name, spell it if it's a difficult name, any affiliation and then like I said Mark will keep the time. As usual there won't be any opportunity for back and forth just state your comments so whoever wants to go first.

Mark Deleray: I'll let you know when it's 3 minutes so you can wrap it up.

Dan Smith: I brought some gifts for you guys, you don't have enough to read already. I'll hand these out. This is my spiel. My name is Dan Smith, I'm a fishing guide out of Bozeman but I'm also a recreational angler. I probably spend more time on the river in that capacity so I appreciate an opportunity to address you guys. Today I brought you copies of a recent petition that was created in regards to some of the proposed ideas brought forth by NRC Committee members. I'd like to make it clear this is not a direct attack on Madison River Foundation but more sort of to highlight the vary vocal opposition to the April plan which is still being proposed at the NRC meetings despite its earlier rejection. So what we have here is currently this petition has 1600, 1700 supporters over 720 comments. It's growing each day and yesterday I began printing the comments have come from 40 different states as well as 17 different countries everywhere from Chile to Bosnia to Switzerland. The point I'd like to make is this resource isn't just cherished by us locally in southwest Montana but all over the world. So I realize NRC members have very difficult decisions to make but I want to point out how unpopular some of these ideas are and I'd appreciate it if NRC members will read through these comments and let them sink in before making any drastic decisions. I personally moved to Montana because of our stream access laws. When my wife and I discussed it we ruled out Colorado, Washington, Wyoming because they're not very fair to sportsmen, so this is very important to everyone not only here but around the world. To me some of these April proposals are completely counter to what Montana stands for and I hope you take that into account. I'm going to drop one of these for each of you to read. Thank you for your time.

Eileen Ryce: Who wants to go next? Anybody?

Brian Rosenberg: Hello my name is Brian Rosenberg, I'm an Ennis resident, angler, outfitter, recreationalist. Touching on I think what the petition is going towards a little bit, I think the one of the scariest things for me that I see coming out of this and it has nothing to do with capping me as an outfitter, telling me where I can and can't go as an outfitter, that kind of stuff, it has to do with the nuance of removing boats from the upper part of the river as well as possibly removing them from town down as well. The high water marks I know we're not violating stream access law to say we can't have boats for angling opportunities but when we talk about the recreation out there we're talking about angling so if we remove boats for angling access up there we're going to remove over 90% of recreational opportunities in that area. The other thing I think that's going to happen I think it's lost a little bit, is I think that a lot of us would have an idealistic view of how we can access up there that we can just freely walk in there as far as you want to go with no repercussions. Over 20 years I've seen more, and more, and more no trespassing signs up there so as soon as I cannot access that area via boat someone's going to press charges against me, someone in this room, someone out there and it's going to become apparent that now we can't walk into that area as well and I think we've touched on this very detailed explanation of stream access and whether there is or isn't foot access and there is foot access if I'm in the water and I'm super human and I can walk through all that boulder field

and get in there. But if I can't walk in the water I have to walk on the land and that stream access, that high water mark, that vehicle for me to access that area is either non-existent or microscopic at best. And so that's what I fear the most. I don't fear cap, I don't fear not being able to do my business anymore, I fear loss of access, that's what I fear the most coming out of this process. Thank you, thank you for your time, thank you guys for doing what you're doing. It's really hard, you guys have a lot of big decisions and Travis you're right, this is not the group but bring that up again net reduction and keep rules was a great idea. It was so emotional for people we all freaked out. It was a great idea. Thank you.

Eileen Ryce: Who wants to go next?

Joe Schneider: Hey everyone, thanks very much for the opportunity to comment. Joe Schneider. Obviously there's a tremendous concern by everyone on the Committee and everyone in the room for the long term health and wellbeing of the Madison River fishery. I share that concern. The subject of the tipping point that Dave brought up in the second meeting has been discussed a lot is a really interesting one and as Travis said they don't know exactly where that is or when that might happen or what that might look like if we were to reach it but it occurred to me based somewhat on what Jim suggested of reducing the harvest rates in the upper river if there's concern for the ultimately for that for the fishery, for the long term wellbeing of the fishery, and if Don is correct that any recommendations that are included in your, any ideas included in your recommendation to the Commissioners would qualify as a potentially regulations change suggestion then why not try and weave in the reduction net harvest again based on the NRC. Why not make the Madison River catch and release if ultimately that's what people are most concerned about. As angler numbers rise 200,000 per year catch rates stay at whatever they're at and their invariably, just mathematically hooking mortality also rises right? I think we can all agree that there is less hooking mortality with barbless hooks, fish come off easier, they get back in the water faster and easier, they probably have a higher survival rate even if it's marginal. But if we're concerned about the fishery why not put those in a couple of your recommendations. Barbless hooks only on the Madison River and strictly catch and release throughout the river. No more harvesting of 5 Browns below Varney and it may be statistically insignificant, there's a possibility of that I'm not really sure, but I think it would send a powerful message that this Committee really had the wellbeing of the fishery at heart and I would support that. I practice catch and release pretty much exclusively and pretty much exclusively fish barbless hooks and I know a lot of my peers do to especially the ones that I really respect. Thank you.

Eileen Ryce: Anyone else?

Brian McKeon: I'm Brian McKeon. Just wanted to touch on a couple of things that I've heard everybody discussing today. So, Don your suggestion of the cap on all angler user days, I would encourage the Committee to look, there's on the Deschutes River in Oregon somewhat of a similar plan was put in place so there wasn't a distinction between outfitted use or non-outfitted

use, it's a system that doles out those tags or, I don't know what the permit looks like so like six months out a certain wave of them is released and three months out another wave of them has, is released. A few of the repercussion from that, one thing to mention that is sort of like an island fishery in terms of there's not a lot of other fisheries in that region you pretty much know you're going to go there and fish Deschutes. The Madison's kind of different. You might, you know for example if you're staying in Bozeman you might fish the Yellowstone or the Gallatin, the Madison. One of the unintended consequences of that system, not as much in the outfitter use, the outfitters there are allowed to sign up their guests for those days but there's been kind of a run on those days by recreational anglers that speculate you know, for five bucks I'll buy 40 days-worth of Madison days so I can fish the Madison as often as I want so. It's an interesting idea. There is another model outfit that someone parallels that and it would be worth kind of looking into just to not recreate the wheel and see how it works and also what are the areas it doesn't work. I heard some of the, in the April plan there were some, on the commercial side, zonal caps. One thing that we anticipate comes out of this is some caps whether it's only a commercial use or whether it's all users, you know that's probably the number one concern everybody has is the rapid increase in user days by all users. I want to point out that the April plan you know for example on the upper river it allocated 16 trips per outfitter per day so it was like 3 in the upper wade area, 3 in the lower wade area, 10 in the float zone. The reality of that, that really is not going to curb, if the demand continues for commercial trips that's not effective solution. First of all there's a lot of SRP holders that only use zero or one or two you know trips all season so it's very easy to recruit an SRP holder if you're a lodge or a fly shop and have two or three outfitter permits servicing all of your clients so you know in reality that's a really easy thing to get around if you add up all the allocated days that come with that it's three thousands of percent increase so it's not an effective method of actually capping these, I just wanted to point that out. And rest and rotation was brought up, my biggest concern with rest and rotation is if it were implemented in the float zone because it's so short, it's only 37 miles it has a lot of unattended negative consequences so for example with that zone is in the middle of the river, you know sometimes the river's at levels you can't get under certain bridges or you know when the rivers high you get in a boat and you might float 20 miles and if you can't do that now you're going to have to get out, go back up, do a second float so it can, at certain times of the year basically double the amount of use of boat ramps which is one area that people have expressed concern about so. Just a couple of ideas. You guys are doing a great job and I very much appreciate it.

Eileen Ryce: Anyone else?

Dan Larson: I'm Dan Larson with Madison Valley Ranch, a resident here in Bozeman. Our property is over just off of Jack Creek on the channel section of the ranch. We're a fly fishing lodge. One's a housekeeping request for the task force and that is to, in order to provide useful timely public comment to you it would be really great to like get these eight suggestions that we could see and whether you could post that on your website tonight so we can have access

or I'll put the first \$20.00 into the kitty to have them copied. I'm sure others would volunteer, so we can understand the detail because you're really getting into the details now and we could provide better comments to you. Secondly the suggestion on the cap that's coming out more and more and I understand that, I would comment to go back to your stated problem which was primarily a congestion or over usage in peak periods and yet you're talking about a cap total usage that doesn't address peak periods but may have unintended consequences on other times. And especially if it's on a first come first serve basis. They could all be used early in the season and you have nothing left in the fall and then a practical question is how does a business like ours, we're somewhat captive on the Madison River and we have groups booking with us and sometimes those groups don't finalize who's coming until the last 30 days. How do we protect ourselves? They've already paid a deposit, we've booked the guides, and outfitters, how do we work on that. So a lot of administrative questions that I would come up with on that and then most non-resident anglers are probably fishing one to five days. That's it. You give some non-resident landowners that are here for the summer and they have 100 days. They're out there every day. Are they all counted the same in your usage? Thank you very much.

Eileen Ryce: Anyone else?

Zach Montana: My name is Zach Montana. I've lived in Bozeman for about 15 years. I just want to thank you guys for allowing a forum for public comment. I think that's super helpful and just awesome for transparency and getting everything out there. Overall I'm in agreement that crowding on the Madison River is an issue and that sense of crowding is something needs to be addressed through some form of regulation in order to maintain the fishery and just continue producing awesome experiences for people that use the river regardless of how they use it. I do have a couple of concerns primarily restricting boats in the float section or in the wade sections excuse me that was a major concern for me. Some of the best days of fishing in my life have been on those sections of the Madison River access via boat. I've two young sons and it would be nearly impossible for them to join me and fish you know without using some sort of vessel to access a lot of that area so that's an important part that I have some concerns with. As I've heard echoed by a couple of people wading for significant distances in those sections is pretty challenging even for tall fit people. You know you can get yourself around but there's a reason that there's big billboards saying no trespassing because a lot of people feel like they need to trespass in order to navigate up and down that river corridor. So I think that might promote even more conflict between landowners and anglers and things like that so that's a major concern for me. Another concern about you know limiting boats or not allowing boats in the wade sections it almost seems to me that it had the opposite effect of one of the primary goals of this Committee to reduce that sense of crowding. If boats and guides, public alike can't use boats to access that you know elderly, kids, a big swath of anglers are essentially not going to have access to some of the best water on the upper Madison specifically so that's a major concern of mine as well. Again I really appreciate the time letting us provide some public comment and thanks for that opportunity.

Eileen Ryce: Anybody else? Got everyone? Oh, last one?

Todd France: I'm Todd France outfitter in Ennis Montana and one of my big concerns today that I'm hearing is the talk of the capping of the total number of days of not just non-commercial use but primarily non-resident use from my community. Our community depends very heavily on being able to have its business open all year around regardless if a certain number of days are reached as Dan touched on. My mom actually owns the liquor store in Ennis which depends heavily on more than just people like me but also on the aspect of other people coming in after a fine day of fishing on the Madison River and for them to show up in Ennis Montana on August 1st all the days would already used up would be tragic for many, many businesses throughout my community and I would ask you to please keep that in mind. Thanks for your time.

Eileen Ryce: Anyone else want to make public comment? Did we get everybody? No one else? There will be another opportunity for public comment tomorrow at 4:30 or thereabouts. I wanted to just quickly address the Committee. Sorry I was late getting here this morning. It was Don's fault. I won't be here tomorrow but if any of you need anything just shoot me a note or call the office. I'll see what I can do. Mark and Travis, I believe are going to be here tomorrow. I also wanted to mention we did submit agenda items for the April Commission meeting and we do have the item on there for the Madison rules so you'll probably see that go out publicly soon so that has been submitted. The April Commission meeting is late in the month, I can't remember what the date is, twenty something so. Other than that like I said if you need anything from me just shoot me a note, let me know. Thanks. Thanks Mike.

Julie Eaton: I'm sorry I

Mike Mitchell: Julie

Julie Eaton: Yes the Commission meeting is April 25th and you're saying we have to (unintelligible)

Eileen Ryce: No I'm saying we've put the item on the Commission agenda, if you get it done in time great, if not I'll have to pull the item.

Julie Eaton: Gotcha

Eileen Ryce: But it's on there. I didn't want anyone to panic if you suddenly saw it because it will be getting released publicly soon so it is out there. The next meeting will be June.

Tim Aldrich: Eileen is there a drop dead date in terms of whether this Committee was to finish this work if they don't get it done tomorrow?

Eileen Ryce: For the April meeting, there is a drop dead date, I can't remember what that is.

Tim Aldrich: Does that affect all of us?

Eileen Ryce: It would be like the first week in April I'm thinking. Towards the end of the first week

Don Skaar: When the materials go to the Commission.

Eileen Ryce: Yeah, it's normally about two weeks before the Commission meeting.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Eileen Ryce: That we have to get materials to the Commission so

Tim Aldrich: Usually the agenda gets completed 10 days before available to the public and the Commission.

Eileen Ryce: Yeah, yep, so I don't know, so that's like what three weeks from now?

Don Skaar: Yeah

Eileen Ryce: Probably, (unintelligible) to make the April meeting you've probably got about 3 weeks to get it all wrapped up and that would include the work that we have to do on our end to get things ready for the Commission.

Jim Slattery: We have to do something next week if we have to.

Eileen Ryce: If you want to make the Commission meeting in April yeah, otherwise it'll be June. Anything else for me? Okay, you guys all have my contact information if you need anything else.

Mike Mitchell: So going around these are the alternatives that everybody agreed upon. And they are numbered 1 through 8 now and so that will match up with the 1 through 8 on the top of the spreadsheet. And remember that status quo and the April rule are not included here right? They're already going to be filled out on the spreadsheet with your old scores. You're more than welcome to adjust those however you see fit but the new scores you're going to enter are for only these alternative 1 through 8. Does that make sense? All right. Good to go?

Unidentified Speaker: Could you post those your website, the 1 through 8 you just handed out?

Mike Mitchell: I don't know. What does the Committee want to do?

Tim Aldrich: Is it possible?

Mike Mitchell: I don't know if it's possible to do it on the website by tomorrow, I honestly don't know.

Eileen Ryce: No we can't get it on the website tonight.

Unidentified Speaker: Can you make copies?

Mike Mitchell: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Speaker: Can you make copies?

Unidentified Speaker: Could it go out to the e-mail list at the sign in spot?

Mike Mitchell: This is really not up to me. This is up to the Committee so these are drafts and that's one thing I want to be very clear about. These are drafts and sometimes that can be misunderstood so it's up to the Committee whether you want your draft work to be available to others or not so Committee?

Michael Bias: I don't have a problem with it.

Scott Vollmer: I don't either

Melissa Glaser: I don't either. That's fine.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT SAME TIME

Scott Vollmer: Obviously up to the Committee but Sarah are you e-mailing this to us?

Sarah Sells: I'm e-mailing each of you your consequence table and the (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: Is it a Word document?

Sarah Sells: Yes

Scott Vollmer: You know anybody who's here in the public just to save a little work for FWP I'd be happy to e-mail it to them tonight?

Eileen Ryce: I can make copies to save e-mailing

Don Skaar: Yeah just make copies

COMMITTEE TALKING AT SAME TIME

Scott Vollmer: Dan for example I'd be happy to e-mail

Mike Mitchell: Okay so

Scott Vollmer: With the preface there this is a draft.

Jim Slattery: Yeah, it's got to say these are just drafts (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: Not a final product.

Mike Mitchell: Is everybody on the Committee comfortable with that?

Eileen Ryce: Let's do hard copies, cause it's easy enough for me to, I'll go do that now.

Mark Deleray: How many copies do we need?

Eileen Ryce: I'll make a bunch.

Unidentified Speaker: Make 20

Mike Mitchell: Okay does that get it done then? Jim

Jim Slattery: Could I get a printout of the Excel sheet?

Mike Mitchell: Yeah, I can do that. It's alright I understand.

Don Skaar: That's is how I did it last time

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Mike Mitchell: What's that? I shamed you, I publicly shamed you.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mike Mitchell: Yes I did

Don Skaar: Eileen's done that already too.

Mike Mitchell: Okay, anything else before we adjourn. Going once, twice, three times.
Good job today folks. Thank you.

MADISON RIVER NEGOTIATED RULE MAKING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES FROM MARCH 26, 2019

Mike Mitchell: So anybody get any sleep last night? Long night? Want to see the results of your hard work? Okay, pass them around. So these are, this is the average values of members of the group and along the bottom you'll see for the alternatives the sums and where all the consequences that you estimated and this is a bar graph of those sums. So this shows you based on your consequences and fundamental objectives how do each of your alternatives score out across the entire group.

Michael Bias: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: What's that?

Michael Bias: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: I don't hear you Mike

Michael Bias: You don't have that one?

Mike Mitchell: No but the numbers are right along the bottom of the page. So take some time to absorb and cogitate and then we'll talk about it. So some things to think about is in addition to overall decision support you can see if there're any fundamental objectives that are not particularly making a difference and then look at tradeoffs within alternatives, where do they perform well, where do they kind of drop the ball.

COMMITTEE READING VALUES

Mike Mitchell: I don't want to rush anybody at all but let me know when it's time for discussion. Mark was that a

Mark Odegard: Yes

Mike Mitchell: That was a yes? Is there anybody that would like more time? Let's take all the time we need, again there's no rush. Anyone? Okay so now's the time for discussions that I think everybody has been wanting to have all along. Based on this there's some ground rules I'll put out there. First off nothing about this or those makes the decision for you. This information is to help to understand how to make the best decision. So the alternative that might be the best may not be up there. The important thing is that this analysis should help guide the discussion. So if there is a particular weakness it has identified it in an alternative or if there's an alternative that is clearly disqualified. Let's go ahead and make that call. If in going through this process you feel that you've learned about scoring the objectives, the alternatives, and you want to change something totally fine. This is transparent we have all of your values we have the average values we can go through and do anything you want with those numbers. So all you

got to do is say so. You want to add a fundamental objective you want to lose a fundamental objective, you want to add an alternative we'll add an alternative. You want to change consequences we'll change the consequences. If like we did with Mike on the learning exercise yesterday if you feel like your numbers reflect reality better than what you're seeing up here we'll put them up there so everybody can see them and talk about it. So again this can inform the discussion, it doesn't make the decision for you. And if there are any concerns we can address them up here. Alright? Are there any questions? Okay so what do you guys think? Mark?

Mark Odegard: I had a lot of trouble with riparian anglers.

Mike Mitchell: Uh huh

Mark Odegard: I'm just trying to see what the issue is. I'm not sure there is an issue. Everybody looks like they scored it about the same either a 2 or 3 and because, unless somebody can tell me what the issue is and none of the, if there is an issue it didn't seem that any of the alternatives address whatever the issue is.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah that's true there's, in terms of the estimated consequences scores across the alternatives really don't vary much. So from a SBM perspective what's affecting the decision not what is ultimately important that's just saying that those two fundamental objectives are not affecting the decision. It'll be up to you what you guys want to do but essentially you could drop those two objectives in that bar chart the relative heights, the relative support wouldn't change across the alternatives.

Scott Vollmer: I agree with you on that Mark. The other one I noticed and I think we all kind of expected this is when you restrict people at all there's going to be displacement. And you look at the numbers for displacement both on the Madison and two other rivers and those are all fairly similar as well. (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Yeah so getting rid of those probably wouldn't affect the scores along the bottom very much. Or at least their relative (unintelligible).

Michael Bias: Yeah, I don't think we get rid of the (unintelligible) because displacing from the upper to the floor of the Madison and displacing from the upper to the Yellowstone it's still displacement.

Mike Mitchell: Sure and if you want to keep them in there that's fine I'm just saying they're not making much of a difference.

Don Skaar: I guess in my mind those are pretty important to keep in there. I'd hate to eliminate considering those are to me extremely important objectives and as Mike said look at 10B you know we don't even have one that meets neutral there so none of them are obviously doing a good job minimizing displacement.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah that's an important insight I think. Displacement isn't making a difference in the decision analysis but it's, yeah, looking across the board all of these do not do a very good job dealing with displacement.

Mark Odegard: I think addressing that, I've thought about it quite a bit, the only way you're going to be able to really do that is to have permits for sections of the river. That's the only way I can see to do it. So you'd have a, distribute the permits over the whole river rather than concentrating in certain areas.

Don Skaar: Or your citizen days or your wade days versus float days and you can

Mark Odegard: I'm not sure citizen days would do much except make citizens happy.

Don Skaar: Well it's just taking a subset of the users and then letting them use that chunk of the river so there's that potential to reduce crowding that way.

Julie Eaton: Or increase it.

Don Skaar: I'm sorry?

Julie Eaton: Or increase it.

Don Skaar: You mean on the

Julie Eaton: By shutting an area

Don Skaar: In the other areas

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible) displacement. We were talking about displacement.

Jim Slattery: (unintelligible) displacement

Mark Odegard: That's one of the reasons I put in do it like basically hunting you have allocations for different areas or number of hunters or number of animals taken. I think probably going to get to there some day but not sure when.

Mike Mitchell: So I want to make sure I'm understanding what you're saying Mark. So right now none of the alternatives really address displacement very well according to the group. So if you were to add a rule to improve displacement, okay, what are you proposing?

Mark Odegard: Well I think it's eventually going to come down to permitting sections of the river.

Mike Mitchell: Okay but is there a rule or something that you would suggest the Committee implement when they make a recommendation to the Commission that we can add to an alternative?

Mark Odegard: I was thinking about this a lot and trying to put something up unfortunately after our first meeting I got a call and a guy said I need this done and we're going to give you a lot of money to do it so I didn't have the time to put something coherent together.

Mike Mitchell: Okay is, does anybody else want to propose language along the lines of what Mark is saying?

Michael Bias: I don't want to propose any language but the idea of displacement there's really no such thing as a good displacement. Any restrictions we do is going to have I think some type of displacement. You're taking people out of one area and putting them onto the other area so you got an area where say it's non-resident day you pull all the non-residents out of there you reduce, there is none there but you put them all somewhere else so there's no, if we do that we're going to get greens in displacement. It doesn't make sense to me. We're not going to get a green it's going to be

Mark Odegard: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Unless we're dealing with some sort of plan that includes the Yellowstone, Missouri and all the other rivers and even then how are you going to manage displacement. I think displacement's an artifact of anything you impose so it's never going to be green.

Don Skaar: Yeah I see your point but I think there's a couple components to that too, I mean displacement can be from crowding or it can also be from just dissatisfaction with the fishing experience. So I mean,

Michael Bias: Right

Don Skaar: so that's, that was the idea originally behind the rest rotation for the citizen days. That would, that would deal with some of the displacement. It wouldn't deal with the crowding aspect.

Michael Bias: Right but it, but my point is that you know, while doing one thing you make it good in one area and really bad in the other area.

Jim Slattery: Yeah I think it's just tradeoffs.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE.

Mark Odegard: I guess I was talking balance rather than you're going to have displacement even if you balance.

Jim Slattery: Even if you balance, yeah because somebody wants to fish there and they can't so they got to go down there and they're displaced.

Tim Aldrich: You're saying you do (unintelligible) like temporal or spatial you're (unintelligible) **(A LOT OF BACKGROUND NOISE MAKES IT REALLY HARD TO HEAR TIM)**. Potentially reducing the number of people trying to do the same thing, in the same place, at the same time (unintelligible) spatial. (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: On the temporal side though I think one thing about displacement you know if you're looking into the future those alternatives that try to cap growth that's going to contribute to modifying displacement in the future and so I don't think that's, so it's not all that simple.

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Just on that decision analysis point of view I think this is reinforcing what everybody's saying. None of these is really going to make much of a difference on displacement and (unintelligible) the alternatives and it's not helping us distinguish (unintelligible). So yeah where you move people off the river which way is the pile up (unintelligible) that's what I'm reading here.

Julie Eaton: Mike, that's right it doesn't do much for the numbers but I like that it's a place holder that we acknowledge the things that are moving around are having this affect or not.

Mike Mitchell: Sure yeah

Julie Eaton: It's like a, we paid attention, we didn't fix it but we're paying attention.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah I think that's a really good point.

Jim Slattery: I see another one here, non-commercial, non-anglers that's pretty consistent too.

Mike Mitchell: Well okay so those numbers are not absolute and kind of depends on what the group thinks about say you know there's a difference between a three and a three point eight so on the scale of three has no affect really okay and four is a good affect does the difference between a three no affect, three point eight just about two short of a good affect do you folks think that's relevant?

Tim Aldrich: I look up above it that the shuttles line which is members of that larger group they do show significant changes you know (unintelligible). I think we got in trouble with non-commercial non-anglers (unintelligible) might be (unintelligible).

Mark Odegard: I have a comment on businesses, I'm used to doing economic analysis whenever we drill a well in the oil industry we do a 15 to 30 year economic analysis and one of

the biggest problems we have is uncertainty. The imposition retroactively of reducing the number of people on the river is a real negative affect on that kind of thinking I think. And I see in a lot of these alternatives people say no we're going to do it based on 2016 or maybe 2018 although 18 doesn't have the numbers I think I would be a lot happier if we put in something like based on this year's numbers maybe plus 10% that would give people who were planning like building a new lodge that we heard or about Madison Foods is thinking about expanding. People that have drift boats business maybe thinking about buying a drift boat or already have and now they're worried that they can't pay for it. Shuttle people may have thought about buying a new shuttle or maybe they have, how are they going to pay for that. And they based that on an analysis they did using basically current numbers.

Mike Mitchell: So that's a really good point. One of the things that we didn't consider in this is whether this 1 to 5 scale really makes sense. If there's an alternative way of scoring those out okay so economically. Now the one thing so where's our effects on business?

Melissa Glaser: Number 7

Mike Mitchell: Where is that?

Scott Vollmer: Yeah 7

Mike Mitchell: Okay so let's say we're going to do something like you're saying Mark, so we have some estimate of what, what it is and you're talking about number to start with?

Mark Odegard: Well people that talked about capping the number of floats.

Mike Mitchell: No I mean you said let's start and then add 10% starting with what?

Mark Odegard: This year they're going to do another survey for the river that's starting, I'm not sure when it's going to be finished but we'll have numbers on the river sometime at the end of 2019 I guess?

Mike Mitchell: Oh, so you're talking about something different from like dollars, economy?

Mark Odegard: Right

Mike Mitchell: Well what fundamental objective, okay I'm not catching it

Mark Odegard: I'm not that good at analysis and businesses around here so I can't put it in real numbers

Mike Mitchell: Okay I'm just trying to understand.

Mark Odegard: Yeah, but I know what the affect is when you don't know how to plan.

Mike Mitchell: So let's talk about what you're suggesting. Is there a particular fundamental objective that you would suggest to this add 10% to a base number?

Mark Odegard: No, this cap

Mike Mitchell: Yeah but which fundamental objective?

Mark Odegard: That's in alternatives, some of the

Mike Mitchell: Okay so you're talking about changing an alternative and then

Mark Odegard: Yeah, most of the, many of the alternatives have a cap on number of boats, number of (unintelligible), number of whatever.

Mike Mitchell: Okay, I understand. Okay so you're saying change that cap over time

Mark Odegard: Well I'm saying let's tell people what's going to happen we can probably project what's going to happen if that number of users keeps going up as it has, maybe it'll turn over this year we're not sure but so but you could project what would be based on a linear retraction on (unintelligible) we have now.

Jim Slattery: I think what Mark is saying is that we, whatever caps that we do will be based on the 2019 numbers and then add 10% (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Okay, all right, is that what you're saying Mark?

Mark Odegard: Exactly.

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Mark Odegard: Because then people that have already planned are going to get screwed

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Mark Odegard: then they can at least plan people that are in the process of planning can look ahead to what's going to happen.

Mike Mitchell: Okay, so we're just thinking out loud.

Jim Slattery: Yeah so that would be like non-residents and then commercial angler users primarily

Mike Mitchell: Yeah so let's go up to those. Go to satisfaction. There we go. If we were, pick an alternative it doesn't matter at this point, if we were to do that for all of the alternatives besides the status quo in the April rule how do you think it would change those numbers? So Jim you mentioned uh, what was it non-anglers or

Jim Slattery: Yeah non, no it would be commercial anglers.

Mike Mitchell: Okay so how do you think if we changed that cap, added 10% to it to allow for growth in the future how would it change the numbers for the non-anglers, I'm sorry commercial anglers?

Melissa Glaser: I think that just capping the commercial and then adding 10% probably wouldn't change much but when you look at the non-resident restrictions

Jim Slattery: yeah that

Melissa Glaser: and add 10% that still freaks me out as far as capping non-residents so I, my answer would still be pretty low as far as maximizing satisfaction.

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Michael Bias: I think with (unintelligible) numbers, there's already essentially a built in plus or minus (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: there's not

Michael Bias: It's based on 17 numbers but it incorporates growth. It's already built in. Some of these other ones didn't you know, go back to 16 for example on commercial users, 2016 we have almost 10 less than we did in 17 but we don't have how many are in 2018 so it depends on how I think how finite, how fine a cap. If we say we're going to use 2016 numbers (unintelligible) if you look at alternative 4 there's sort of ranges built in.

Mike Mitchell: I'm sorry Mike I didn't catch that

Michael Bias: If they do alternative 4 there's essentially ranges built in and so it takes growth into account.

Julie Eaton: In this point without really getting some really hard numbers about growth and things, I think you would just see numbers change based on opinions, (unintelligible) I think it just would be (unintelligible) at this point.

Mike Mitchell: I think a lot of this is (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Well yeah it goes without saying but I think that would just be (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: (unintelligible) So that's another option available is in going through this maybe we learned that there's some critical knowledge missing that just make it really, really hard to make a good decision. If we could get that knowledge first but that's the way it is with every decision and a decision still needs to be made so what is realistic, what knowledge is realistic to obtain in time to make a good decision. And when that knowledge is not realistic, it's

like we got to wait and do 10 years-worth of surveys on something before we can see a trend, can you wait 10 years to make the decision. So that's a tough position to be in but that's also reality. We never have the quality of information we would like and it's only when, it's like, (unintelligible) absent information no clue, no idea.

Jim Slattery: We have some information in regards to the non-residents. It's in your binders here. Traditionally from 1982 to 2015 75% of the users are non-residents so and it's a plus or minus 5% so if you go to 80% or if you go down to 70% or thereabouts. We know that's what that is and the economy from West Yellowstone to Ennis is kind of built on that. It's a tourism based economy. I mean that's how people make their living there. The whole town of Ennis is totally dependent on it. So is West Yellowstone. So I think if we start capping non-residents to 60%, 50%, I mean you're talking 30% of your income is wiped out. I mean that's the real hard facts of this.

Mike Mitchell: Just curious Jim for the ones that really scored low for non-residents do these alternatives put caps on them?

Jim Slattery: Yes, but we have to take this into consideration totally.

Michael Bias: The Madison more than, certainly more than the Big Hole and Beaverhead is a non-resident river.

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Michael Bias: It's in the middle of nowhere. Everybody comes from everywhere to get there.

Jim Slattery: Yeah, and you know people that do own property there, you know they're non-resident most of them and then if they have their friends or children come or family come they're non-residents too and it's like their paying taxes and then oh we can't give you a stamp today. That just doesn't seem like it's going to work.

Don Skaar: So I totally get your point Jim. Alternative 8 how do you feel about that in that regard? I mean because that takes it from being a resident, non-resident issue to a commercial, non-commercial issue and that you know alternative 8 does something for me because it caps use so we aren't going to get more crowded but it's allocating the commercial sector to what it already has.

Jim Slattery: Yeah I think we're in big trouble if we start separating resident from non-resident.

Don Skaar: Is that a better

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Don Skaar: I mean I'm not saying you have to love it, I'm just

Jim Slattery: It's better but I think Mark brings up a great point of there's no growth that people have already committed to I mean if someone's building a lodge or what not, it's kind of 2017 and then they try to base it from there so maybe that's, we can use 2017 and then add 10% or 15%. I think

Don Skaar: I see

Julie Eaton: Well Jim just change it. You know change it to whatever you want or whatever we want. It's like you know this wage things coming out big time to me and there's some good suggestions about how to get those numbers up so yeah, change it.

Jim Slattery: Well yeah, I would agree. But I think the only numbers that we have are from 2017 right?

Don Skaar: Yeah

Jim Slattery: So if we go 10, 15% off of those numbers for an increase maybe that gives us, levels out what's existing, what's in the mix and then at that point there's probably not going to be great expansion in the valley as far as new lodging or stuff like that but there'll still be growth because every year you know things get more expensive. So kind of stay at the status quo. I think most people who own a business can live with that.

Tim Aldrich: I don't think we can discount what's going on in Bozeman (unintelligible) with the growth.

Jim Slattery: yeah

Tim Aldrich: I mean I moved away for 22 years and I can't find my way around there now.

Jim Slattery: Yeah that's yeah

Tim Aldrich: So I mean a lot of boat (unintelligible) garage over there.

Jim Slattery: Yeah well it's 18% on the pie chart, 18 of the 25% or whatever, or 29%, 18% of it is from Gallatin County. And Gallatin County only has about 5 miles of Madison River that goes through it. That I know of.

Mark Odegard: That's the upper river

Jim Slattery: The upper river, yes thank you.

Mark Odegard: The lower river is almost three quarters (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: Okay but of the upper river yes

Mark Odegard: But Jim brought another thing I brought up early on. We have non-residents that are paying taxes to the State of Montana and they, property taxes and they license their cars here because it's a better deal paying \$200 a year than in California so they're adding to the economy that way all year and I would like to see them split out as a separate group and do an analysis and ask a question 1 are you resident or non-resident and if they say non-resident you ask them do you own property here.

Julie Eaton: To get that information you mean?

Mark Odegard: To get that information. I know a lot of them and they contribute to the community.

Jim Slattery: Yes, yes, in a lot of different ways.

Mike Mitchell: So one thing that I'll ask you to do (unintelligible) for alternatives, new alternatives go ahead and jot it down. Sarah is doing some of it, she doesn't necessarily have your perspective so if you have these ideas please keep track of them.

Michael Bias: Is there a way through these alternatives and ask whoever presented them? We didn't detail any of these for example alternative 4 is pretty detailed and it's cumbersome to read through compared to alternative 8 you know it's based on 17 numbers it's at least for commercial and some of these other alternatives (unintelligible) a group for example alternative 1, I don't have the details for that just what's on here so I think, I know we don't need, whoever came up with these we should discuss how they came about, how they came up with this alternative.

Melissa Glaser: I didn't (unintelligible) alternative and capping non-commercial days with 2017 numbers I just don't know how that would work so it's really hard for me to determine how (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: When we went through the objectives we put them out and we said talked about it and discussed it, we haven't done that with any of these. It seems we're getting down to the nubs here so

Julie Eaton: Alternatively I think that this shows us some things where there's overall weakness so I'm kind of wanting to capture best ideas right now which may lead to adding, subtracting instead of hashing over, I don't know.

Michael Bias: Well there might be a good idea in one of these alternatives but I don't know what it is.

Julie Eaton: Right

Michael Bias: (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: But there's somethings that are glaring that apply to all of them that may make something that was written like oh heck yeah, I don't even want to say that now because like I said this wade thing is so low

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Julie Eaton: But there's some really good alternatives out there, you know

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Julie Eaton: I mean I don't want to ignore that so if you're looking at 8 that's the lowest score so there's some good stuff to put in that so I think there are things that are glaring that we can go hey what's a better idea that can fit in or maybe I don't know, do you see what I'm saying?

Scott Vollmer: Cherry picking things

Don Skaar: Yeah

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: That will blend but don't have way to many negative tradeoffs in other places.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: I'm just saying that this matrix we didn't discuss it

Julie Eaton: Yeah no I get ya

Jim Slattery: Yeah. You know I think we have to take into consideration that the wade anglers might be the biggest segment that are out there.

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible) segment?

Jim Slattery: Segment of anglers out there.

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: I think they might be.

Julie Eaton: I can't make a decision on that.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: I can see the numbers are out

Mark Odegard: I think the numbers are there. I don't know the exactly what they are but I think you're right.

Jim Slattery: Yeah I was perusing this and I think that's something that popped out at me.

Julie Eaton: Yeah show me those numbers but all I can see here is that those numbers are low

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Julie Eaton: And we've got some good options

Jim Slattery: Yeah we do, I agree

Julie Eaton: So let's

Tim Aldrich: I'm going to interject something here just tell you what I'm thinking about I guess. I think one of the major reasons we're here is to deal with the social conflicts and not undo other things. So one of the tools that we put in place in the alternatives to do something about social conflicts and I guess I, and I look at the totals as far as overall I see there's alternatives 4, 6, and 8 that look almost like status quo in terms of total numbers and I, status quo is what put us here to look at some things that might need some modification over time. So I, now we're talking about some things and I look at wade anglers and that just came up, look across at wade anglers, wade anglers represents people that are feeling stressed and maybe losing some of the quality in their experience you know because of conflicts on the waters (unintelligible) same thing at the same time and same place. (unintelligible) in the waters.

Julie Eaton: That's perfect so you up the wade and what do you do that 4, 6, and 8 if you figure out a better way to address wade anglers what do you do to those 3 numbers?

Tim Aldrich: Just look up and down the line on 4, 6, and 8 and status quo we shouldn't change.

Melissa Glaser: Except on social conflict it went from 2, 2.1, 2.5 to 4 and 6, and 8 are all over 3 and another thing I find that's really interesting and those at least 4 and 8 is those are the commercial caps that are put in there and even the commercial angler users are way up 4.1 satisfaction so it just shows that the commercial community is okay with taking a cap for the sake of the river to try to help with the social conflict. Because we have those solid numbers I think going forward we implement things that address all the numbers in every other section that's not commercial and use that maybe in the future 5 years from now see what we need to do there and then we'll have solid numbers. We have solid numbers commercially and they're willing to do something (unintelligible).

Jim Slattery: So yeah

Mark Odegard: Those numbers are high because of the trending and testing that's required from those (unintelligible) it seems like something we ought to put in across the board.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: And we can see how the ones that are green in wade anglers how they would fit into the ones that we were just discussing and add caps.

Julie Eaton: Massage them somehow

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible) them or not

Julie Eaton: That's a good discussion.

Don Skaar: I think really the, what I'm just guessing what got the scores high on some of those alternatives for the wade anglers was the tension of the walk-wade sections,

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: the difference of the score there.

Julie Eaton: But we can still bump it.

Melissa Glaser: So maybe in that section

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: Those three alternatives it's opening the wade sections to fishing from a vessel so maybe we just keep those sections at status quo and then those wade anglers (unintelligible).

Don Skaar: I think that would get the scores up

Jim Slattery: Well yeah that would get it up to there but I think they'd be at a 3 kind of status quo so those wade anglers wouldn't be represented in here as well. That's all I would say to that. So there might be some other alternatives like on rule number 1 which is what I proposed one of the things that glares out at me is the accessibility issue is terrible so maybe that's something else that we could include into it and the other one that scored really well that I can remember is the one I think that alternates the days, is that 5,

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: yeah, and then 7 scored really well too.

Julie Eaton: Something I'd like to throw out there I think we talked about it in a small group is if you have and this is maybe my experience with this, if you have access to the wade area by boat but you have to get out of the boat, that doesn't get that boat out of there.

Jim Slattery: right

Julie Eaton: I am not a park in the middle of the river kind of gal. The people I work with they know that when I come to part of a river and people are parked it doesn't make me happy but that's because I've been on the river a long time and that's not how we started but if you are making people park in the wade, you know get out and fish, you're keeping there, run them through on certain days. I mean just let them fish right through. Get them out of there. Fish it get out, if they want to get out fine but get them out.

Jim Slattery: I think from what I'm learning I think they guides aren't the problem for the most part. I think there might be a few guides here and there that might be a problem but I think, the problem here is there's not a lot of guiding going on there in the peak season so I hear about boats coming down there in peak season so that means they're not guides so that's etiquette and stuff like that. I don't know how we can legislate that for lack of a better word so and it's from what I understand from the guides as well it's really not a section of the river you really want to be boating down during the peak part of the season. That's what I've heard. It's dangerous and for some people that might not have experience, we've had some issues down there but I don't think anything, nobody's died yet so I'm just you know, kind of throwing that out. That's the feedback that I'm getting.

Julie Eaton: There's lots of cautions, you could do (unintelligible) but there's some other places you could put in, float them down.

Jim Slattery: Again wade anglers are a big segment of the users out there

Julie Eaton: Yeah so give them (unintelligible) we can do this.

Michael Bias: So I, we're talking, when you're mentioning wade anglers I'm thinking wade to Lyon's

Jim Slattery: Yeah essentially yes

Michael Bias: So a couple of things, my thoughts it's 12.6 miles long, it's the longest single identified stretch in the entire Madison, it's also challenging to wade so my thoughts are if you turn that to a wade only section how, and it's primarily private land (unintelligible) and access is challenging, wading that section is a challenge, even if you posted at boat access are you really going to improve it that much for wade anglers? They go in at Three Dollar Bride, they go in at Pine Butte, they go in at Raynolds. So Raynolds you slide in all the way up to Quake is kind of open fish, what's the extent of waders in that reach if you shut off access to

boats? I think it's going to be (unintelligible) because they just can't get there. So do we need a 12.6 mile section for wade only anglers?

Jim Slattery: Good point,

Michael Bias: And if you close it to access to boats because no one has ever done this, close it to access to boats and then how many wade anglers are you going to have there in the 4 miles below Three Mile Bridge. I bet about zero.

Jim Slattery: I think you'd have more than you think.

Michael Bias: But my point is we don't know.

Jim Slattery: Right

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: We still going to give them that 12.3 mile section so maybe or,

Jim Slattery: I don't know how you would parcel that out because the lower section behind Pine Butte is barely accessible and

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: That middle section is from Three Dollar Bridge down to Pine Butte is where the challenge is for accessibility so (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: Let me ask you this how many commercial or even non-commercial people are launching at Raynolds?

Jim Slattery: I don't know to be honest with you, I don't know.

Michael Bias: Because you know from Raynolds to Three Dollar Bridge is not a walk in the park to row that so I'm thinking, I don't know what I'm thinking. There's ways to manage, you could manage temporally,

MIKE B AND JIM TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: You could manage we could break at 12.6 mile section into smaller sections, you could Raynolds to Three Dollar to Pine Butte, Pine Butte to Lyons those are all big access points. Essentially the only public access points.

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Michael Bias: In it so thinking everybody's (unintelligible) here we're thinking Quake Lake to Lyons and maybe we should be thinking smaller segments at that or if we're going to do something with the wade look at that.

Jim Slattery: Well the other part, most of my information or 99% of it is all antidotal what people come and they told me. There's 40 cars at Three Dollar Bridge come July 4th. You put a boat down through those people they're not going to be very happy. I mean that's the reality.

Michael Bias: July 4th

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Michael Bias: If we could push 40 boats in every on the entire river.

Jim Slattery: Right but that section at Three Dollar Bridge is consistently has 20 cars in it starting June 18 clear down to mid-September. I mean average 20 cars easy. That's a lot of people just in that one area

Michael Bias: Okay

Jim Slattery: so

Michael Bias: (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: That's way I propose the temporal where it's June 18 to October 1st. I mean obviously there's room to slide.

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) my temporal I understand that.

Jim Slattery: yeah

Michael Bias: That's from everything above Lyons Bridge.

Jim Slattery: Yes

Michael Bias: But you're talking (unintelligible) Three Dollar Bridge which is 8 miles up from Lyons Bridge

Jim Slattery: right, well conversely the West Fork and all that up in there is loaded with people too they're parked on both sides of the river, it's that's the most heavily fished section of the river is probably right there for wade anglers.

Michael Bias: Three Dollar?

Jim Slattery: Three Dollar down to West Fork

Michael Bias: I think it's to Three Dollar and West Fork

Jim Slattery: Yes, up to Pine Butte

Michael Bias: and Pine Butte's in the middle of those

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) Raynolds to Three Dollar?

Jim Slattery: I'm trying to think of you know

Michael Bias: Saturday Raynolds to Three Dollar or Raynolds to Pine Butte so a lot of folks are going to Pine Butte down there.

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Michael Bias: So (unintelligible) on Saturdays is (unintelligible). See what I'm getting at?

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Michael Bias: We're to the rubber on the road here so tell me what you want

Jim Slattery: I think well I think during the peak season Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, it doesn't matter you got tons of people there so I think that's, and that's when the people come in and complain the most is during the peak season. I was down there fishing and this guy just went right over where I was working a fish.

MIKE B AND JIM TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: And we know that it's not the guides.

Michael Bias: Right so

Jim Slattery: and then oh the guy comes down with 2 boats, him and his buddy come down 2 and they park (unintelligible) they just take over the rest of the river and they stand there for 5 hours

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible) guide boat to, I mean you know

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Julie Eaton: It happens

Michael Bias: Yeah those guys (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: I understand

Michael Bias: Is there a way to break up the upper section, is there temporal restrictions other than July October, June October.

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Michael Bias: And if so I'll just throw the rest out, dude what do we do with the channel? Let's just talk about, because some of these is open to, in the channel to this walk wade in the upper.

Jim Slattery: Right

Michael Bias: If we could just talk about the upper

Jim Slattery: Yeah

MIKE B AND JIM TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: That's what I'm proposing

Mike Mitchell: We're discussing, we're detailing your alternative

Jim Slattery: Yes we are

Julie Eaton: But we're not hearing from Charlotte because you've got some really specific things too.

Charlotte Cleveland: That's what I'd like to see in

Julie Eaton: You have not wiggle room on that?

Charlotte Cleveland: No I like the other alternative as well odd days, even days, flexible on that for sure

Jim Slattery: Mike so, I'm sorry Charlotte, if we use temporal what would you like to see? If it's going to be temporal what would you like to see?

Michael Bias: My experience with temporal understand comes from VH2, so there's Saturday Sunday stuff primarily Beaverhead is Saturday Sunday where one sections closed Saturday the next sections closed Sunday there's also sections on the Beaverhead that are, third Saturday in May to Labor Day bottom section (unintelligible). Walk wades (unintelligible) was Saturday Sunday thing and (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: yeah

Michael Bias: I'm exploring alternatives right that we're negotiating,

Jim Slattery: Right

Michael Bias: We're to the negotiating part

Mike Mitchell: Here's something I'd suggest

Michael Bias: It's not just me, I'm not, (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: You're speaking for other people so am I

Michael Bias: Trying to

Mike Mitchell: So here's a suggestion, first off its break time. Do people want a break or keep this rolling? This is a good conversation so up to you. Do you want a break? Okay I would suggest that Jim and Mike sit down and think through some of this discussion and have a couple of ideas to propose to the group and we'll go from there. When we get back I'd really like to hear from Charlotte and Lauren. I hear a lot of really good discussion going on but they haven't had a chance to weigh in yet so I'd like to hear from them. How does that sound so 10:30?

COMMITTEE ON BREAK

Mike Mitchell: Okay who are we missing? Okay not that to derail any of the discussion but everything we're hearing is really important obviously and one of the things that I was thinking about if we have some necessary important base so how to (unintelligible) we might split out groups (unintelligible) discuss about that. And they can come back to the Committee with here's some ideas Committee what do you think. And there may be other issues along those lines that would be good to do that as well. Let's keep a finger on these things that are turning out to be really critical and we'll come back to them so the discussion is not over right now. Everybody agree to that? Okay so left off with it would be really good to hear from Charlotte and Lauren

Jim Slattery: Yes

Mike Mitchell: let us know what you think. The floor is yours.

Charlotte Cleveland: Okay, I don't know if you want me to talk about my alternative but I can tell you where I'm coming from and that is as a resident angler. I find myself when I read the survey information falling into the 70% of resident anglers that have changed their fishing use of the river and I've only lived here for 5 years. So for me to fish Raynolds I get up at 5, leave the house at 6, I'm on the river at 7:30, I'm off the river before what we call the brunch fishermen arrive. So I already fall into this unfortunate 70% of resident anglers who have changed how they fish the river. I don't fall into the 67.4% that fish the river less frequently. We just get up at 4, 5, whatever time and we go. We do tend to seek like 68.9% of the resident anglers times and places where there is less crowding. And I, we do fish the shoulder seasons. I've actually put on 14 pieces of clothing to fish in March and to fish in November. I fished 69 days last year and a

lot of them were in the walk wade section or in the Park or on the Gallatin. I just think that the, regardless of whether it's the non-residents are 75% or 68.9% they're making choices for me. Now that I'm a Montanan, I kind of resent that. I kind of think that since I live here I should have the opportunity to fish because I am doing mostly walk wading, and be able to use those rivers in that way which is part of what resulted in my alternative. I think that

Mike Mitchell: Charlotte did you say which one (unintelligible)?

Charlotte Cleveland: Three. Where I think that the overcrowding and social issues have made it harder to fish the walk wade section so I went to the resident days. I'm totally in favor of a boat floating down, people getting out fishing, that is not a problem for me at all, I've encountered them. They've been uniformly polite and I've walked down that section, I've walked up the section at Reynolds and at Three Dollar Bridge and lower, below the walk wade section below the North Fork, fished that tons of times. But I really think that if it is either 75% of non-residents or 68.9% of non-residents that we have to kind of look at saying let's not forget the Montana resident here who is having to adjust the way they fish because it's just too crowded. So my alternative was not to cap the outfitters at all. Feel free do whatever you're doing now. You have all the freedom in the world but I may make you compete for that non-resident client. I don't want to see days be monetized. I think that's a shame, when I saw the ad for 51 days on the Beaverhead for \$60,000 I said to myself also in little print it says no financing available, some one's going to, probably not a Montanan, probably not some young kid who's starting man or woman who wants to become and outfitter they're not going to shell out \$60,000 bucks for the 51 days. That's, that in itself is saying to the Montanan who wants to start out but they want to fish on the Beaverhead you can't do it because you can't afford to do it. So I was moving toward a basically what Don's was, which was the level of, forget what you said, whatever reduces the non-resident population by making them get a stamp when they run out to bad it's, not too bad, I feel for you, but it's going to be the same thing like the Smith River. If you want to fish the Smith River you organize yourself, you put in your application, you keep throwing in those \$5.00 lottery things so that your name gets picked and you make plans just the way the hunters make plans. You decide you're going to fish Montana, and I've talked to two other people that are already booked, two outfitters are already booked and you can tell people in January. That's when they are booking. You've got to get your Madison stamp so you know under my plan you tell them at the same time that they're booking that they've got to get a Madison River stamp and then you can fish. So that's basically where I'm coming from.

Melissa Glaser: Is there any other way that you can see providing more opportunity for residents that doesn't involve a stamp system like this on the Madison?

Charlotte Cleveland: I've given it a lot of thought and I have, I spent a lot of time talking to Travis and Cheryl and Dave about what other alternatives are there, have there been on other rivers, in other places. I'm open to anything but this to me seemed to be the simplest, no hassle for any outfitter, you fish when you want, where you want, anytime you want, I mean the story

that Mike told the other day about wanting to fish the Beaverhead but he couldn't is a sad one to me. And I think Mike should be able to take his kids who are not residents on the Madison River anytime he wants, any day he wants, any place he wants. That's what I set it up for but I do want to give the residents, which is why I did the citizens days, the residents days, I want to give them a chance to get at least in the walk wade section a chance to fish again. Not having to get there at 7:30 in the morning or not having to fish in February or November. It seems that the Montana resident fisherman has been forgotten.

Julie Eaton: Charlotte I really can work with that walk wade and (unintelligible), I mean I fish, we floated last week, my family and my son, he gets off at 2 at MSU he's on the Gallatin. You can't get that kid out of the water so I can understand working with that. Unlike the Smith the Madison has mainstream shops, I'm not one of them so when you run out that walk in I don't know how this addresses the businesses that like people show up in August.

Charlotte Cleveland: I think like the hunting plan, this is very similar to the hunting plan. This is what Travis was telling me, you don't get, there's people who have been waiting for 20 years to get a tag for a specific spot. You don't get one, you're, and this is a Montana resident, so there's a certain mindset where you're going to have to plan and you're going to have to

Julie Eaton: But how does like a grocery store or a fly shop handle

Charlotte Cleveland: Well my limits are not any, I'm going back to the 2016 or 2017 I'm not

Julie Eaton: So you're saying it won't run out, they'd be fine.

Charlotte Cleveland: They were saying that in the, I don't know what river it was, I was trying to keep to the here it is, in the rule section they said that the Commission of the Department recognize there may be impacts to individual small business owners with regard to the requirements of 2-14-111 MCA, the Department has determined that the adoption of the above referenced rules will not significantly and directly impact small businesses so I was trying to keep within the limits

Julie Eaton: but they've already done the economic impact? That's what they did in the April rule?

Charlotte Cleveland: I'm trying to keep within their curtailing growth through using reported use in 2016 and 2017 so I was trying to use exactly the same limits that they were not more restrictive not (unintelligible) measures here. I was using the same thing and that comes out pretty well on the chart. I mean you know the, not on the chart, this, it was not rejected as far as I understand because of the economic impacting significantly, or directly impacting small businesses. The Commission didn't kick it out because of that.

Julie Eaton: Tim didn't

Tim Aldrich: It didn't get to that point

Charlotte Cleveland: Okay

Michael Bias: Charlotte a couple things. Just a couple things one is Eileen talked so I want to discuss something in on that, or ask you something on the plan that kind of negotiation or compromise so in Montana and Eileen Ryce touched on this yesterday and Don can elaborate if need, is that 50% of the Montana Fisheries budget comes from Dingell-Johnson. So Dingell-Johnson is excise tax place on fishing equipment is exactly like Pittman-Robertson for hunting equipment but for fishing equipment so 50% of Montana Fisheries budget comes from that and has a Federal excise tax and that everybody outside of Montana is helping pay for 50% of our budget. Now the other part of that the other 50%, 25 of that or half of that, okay so 25% of the Fisheries budget is from non-resident elk tags. So now we have $\frac{3}{4}$ of Montana Fisheries budget is being paid for and managed by people outside of Montana.

Charlotte Cleveland: I don't understand what you mean by people

Michael Bias: Non-residents

Charlotte Cleveland: You say managed, what do you mean

Michael Bias: Non-residents are paying for

Charlotte Cleveland: Oh, okay

Michael Bias: Montana Fisheries budget

Charlotte Cleveland: Gotcha

Michael Bias: The Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, the Fish part of that budget is $\frac{3}{4}$ is from non-residents.

Charlotte Cleveland: Gotcha

Michael Bias: so that's one thing so I'm talking what's the word, optics right? So imagine if you were to go into Old Faithful, you drive in from the North right you drive all the way from Vermont and you get to Cody, you're going into the Park and the Ranger goes oh, welcome to Yellowstone National Park, oh I see you're from Vermont you can't come in today. It's like what, what are you talking about, too many people looking at Yellowstone Park, so that's the optics I think

Charlotte Cleveland: That's the what?

Michael Bias: Optics

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: look at when they say, when you see the headline that says you know Madison River closed to non-residents.

Charlotte Cleveland: Well let's hope it doesn't say that because that's not what I'm suggesting.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: Have you ever fished the Big Hole during the river closer when they close a section of the river? It's like the only headline you see is Big Hole River is closed. But anyway okay, so that's my point is that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the budget is paid from non-residents. It's an optics issue. I think it's a pretty big one. So to the plan though what if we did implement some kind of residents day but anyone who fishes with an outfitter doesn't need a stamp? So the guy comes to Jim's Lodge and he's staying there and he wants to go fishing and he doesn't have the Madison stamp tag or what you call it, (unintelligible) and then he finds out oh I can fish with a guide I don't need that stamp.

Charlotte Cleveland: I'd have to think about that.

Michael Bias: So non-residents, it's non-resident day on whatever non-resident section unless you're with a guide.

Charlotte Cleveland: I'd have to think about it.

Michael Bias: And I can tell you so we did in 2017 we did 22,124 user days. Our user days, outfitted days individual people being brought fishing were 22,000, whatever the number tags and the majority of our clients were non-residents, I don't know what the percentage was say (unintelligible) so 12,000 user tags or stamps or just anyone (unintelligible) fish with a guide without a non-resident stamp or Madison stamp. So that's the optics of a rule like that but also a, if you're a non-resident that would throw guides and outfitters a big chunk of business if they find out they can't fish on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday unless with a guide. (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: And speaking of optics to Mike (unintelligible) perception, there are a lot of people coming here and let's say it's a family vacation, this happens a lot and what are they doing a lot of times it's the whole point of their vacation is to take the family to the Park. Let's go to Yellowstone National Park and they get into towns like Ennis and West and decide you know maybe father son, maybe mother daughter you name it, it really doesn't matter half of the family does something in the Park one day and low and behold just kind of spur of the moment the other two decide let's go fishing. Let's go fish the Madison for a day and if we get to a point where those people coming in or enough of them that again the perception we say to them we can't do it because all these tags are used up, they're gone, we cannot do that. Eventually a lot of those people will end up saying you know what? Maybe I'll go to Cody next time I do this or maybe I'll go to Yosemite or maybe I'll go somewhere else and those main street businesses the

Joe Dilschneiders, the John Ways of Ennis, the Joe Moores in West Yellowstone it's a struggle for them because what we call walk in business in the fly shop world happens a lot. And this is debilitating for them.

Charlotte Cleveland: I think it, I'm trying to keep within the limits that Fish, Wildlife, and Parks felt that they were not impacting small businesses so I think that, that's important that I'm keeping within those limits so I was hoping that my limits which were in here which were their limits would reflect the same thing. So I'm trying, I'm hoping that, that is true and I think it should be. It's still a lot of use and actually I can even go to 2018 limits if it came to that but I think that they determined already that it would not significantly or directly impact small businesses so I thought keeping within the same restrictions that I would be accomplishing exactly the same thing.

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible) was not a signed document at that point (unintelligible) that option (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: Right

Tim Aldrich: Without any public engagement (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: Right but I have to go with what they said and they determined that they didn't think there was going to be and it certainly, you could certainly change your mind you're the Commissioner but this is what we were given so I assume that you know, they had done enough research to know that it wasn't going to significantly and directly impact small businesses.

Scott Vollmer: And the other thing to is we have to keep in mind is unintended consequences because I personally just from my opinion for what it's worth I think that it will severally, severally might be too strong of a word but it will impact businesses much more so than it says in there.

Charlotte Cleveland: You mean this one.

Scott Vollmer: Right

Charlotte Cleveland: I gotcha

Scott Vollmer: But the unintended consequence is part of this. What you have to consider is the beginning of license year there are a lot of people out there with a lot of discretionary income and maybe their planning a vacation, maybe they're not, they're thinking about in January, March 1st beginning of license year I think is that right Don?

Don Skaar: Yep

Scott Vollmer: (unintelligible) March 1st beginning of license year and I said this yesterday to Tim the unintended consequences is the quote unquote land grab of well maybe I'm going there. It's a \$5.00 stamp or whatever it is the heck with it I'm going to buy it. And then you get to a point very, very quickly within a month where they're gone so that the person who's coming here in May or decides to do their vacation in May let alone what we call the walk in business can't do it and then we put out that, Mike was talking about the optics, the perception of that, maybe Montana doesn't want me to come. Maybe I'll go to Idaho instead, maybe I'll go to Wyoming instead and I think that's very, very important to consider.

Michael Bias: One point on that is when Don you can help me out with this, so what was it 2 years ago almost 3 years ago now the AIS fee was implemented on fishing, aquatic and invasive species

Don Skaar: Yeah

Charlotte Cleveland: Okay

Michael Bias: tag so you look at your license and you got that

Charlotte Cleveland: Yep it's a line

Don Skaar: prevention pass

Michael Bias: so when that was for non-residents that was about 700, 750 pennies, \$7.50 I think

Don Skaar: 15

Michael Bias: 15 for non-residents right and so here we are in 2,000 whatever, 2, 3 years ago 15, 16, and non-resident 2 day license sales are forget what it was, some number up here, they implemented that fee so and that fee applied to 2 day or 10 day licenses and license sales for non-resident 2 day and 10 day license sales dropped by up to 30% by the 2nd year and it affected their budget. Some of their budget runs on non-resident license dollars dropped by 30% and so the idea that, that's my point.

Charlotte Cleveland: I'm trying to understand, the sale of non-resident licenses dropped.

Melissa Glaser: It was \$50.00 for a 2 day license to fish.

Charlotte Cleveland: Okay I gotcha.

Michael Bias: So my point is that this is a, this is an important thing, you need to pay for the program and they hammered the non-residents essentially, hammered's my word and license sales dropped and then we're scrambling at the Legislature (unintelligible) we're having meetings since last April how to recoup those costs, bring those non-resident sales back up but

we deal with non-residents all the time and you know you go to shows and you go, you have paper, I mean it's a lot easier for someone to go well screw it I'll just go to Idaho where none of these other things are occurring. Maybe that could work right except when ¾ of your budget runs on having those non-residents come in. And 25% of them not even from (unintelligible).

Don Skaar: I would hope we would all at some point wish they would go to Idaho. If we have 3 times as many people on the river is that a good experience? I mean I really think this is an opportunity for us to talk about how much growth do we want. It can't be endless here.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: I don't think there's anyone here, I think we're all in agreement, overriding philosophy that growth curve, no one here wants that (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: Let's do something about that here.

Julie Eaton: But let's understand the way we do it because one of the things you hope that word doesn't get out, Charlotte you hope that doesn't become a headline I'm not someone that puts stuff in the paper, I don't send e-mails to my clients about what this is when they, my husband does most of the booking for us, he does all the organization when they ask he says too early to tell, but yet I've had people, he's had people ask him what's going on with the Madison. So it's already out there, we can't hope for it to not be out there.

Charlotte Cleveland: No, no, no,

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Charlotte Cleveland: What he said, the headline that he said, I understand that the discussion about what's going to happen to the Madison is already hit the Wall Street Journal, it's out there.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: the worst case scenario (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: Not worst case it was just saying that Madison River was looking at plans

Julie Eaton: Right and then what booking agencies back in Pennsylvania that we've known for years say so their closing it down that's their interpretation so it's already, that horse is way out of the barn.

Charlotte Cleveland: So it doesn't matter what we do we're screwed.

Julie Eaton: Well I mean eventually when we come up with something that's when I'll tell my people what we're doing and then they'll just have to do what they do.

Charlotte Cleveland: But if the word is out that Fish, Wildlife, and Parks is considering something to

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: it's already there, it's already out there

Julie Eaton: It is

Charlotte Cleveland: so

Jim Slattery: Charlotte, because I'm kind of a numbers guy I think when they made the proposal for capping the outfitters as they did and that's how they based that study. Now if you're going to add the non-residents to it and the real number is this one here 70.6 because there's 1.7 international users and their non-resident, just a minor detail but if you cap it at 60% and there, so that would be 120,000 people based on 200,000 people so and at 70.6 that's 140,000 and change. That's 20,000 user days that's devastating to the local economy.

Charlotte Cleveland: I was trying to keep it to

Jim Slattery: Yeah, yeah

Charlotte Cleveland: this

Jim Slattery: but it's apples and oranges, it's not apples and apples

Charlotte Cleveland: Well what I was trying to do was take the total

Jim Slattery: Right

Charlotte Cleveland: and say that because of that figure

Jim Slattery: right

Charlotte Cleveland: that the Montana angler at some point in time and while their not the economic cash cow that the non-resident is that doesn't mean they deserve less of an experience on the river. I really think that's important and if we're only going to look at the fact that they spend more than a resident I think that's a sad state of affairs, I really do.

Jim Slattery: I can understand where you're coming from but on the other hand from 1982 to 2015 and it looks like 2017 with the plus and minus that's how this economy works here. 75% of the people are non-residents, that's how people's lives, residents lives are based on this fact so I think we have to be really careful

Charlotte Cleveland: I do too

Jim Slattery: on how we, if we do something like that, how do we approach it.

Charlotte Cleveland: I agree, I agree but what I'm saying I don't think that 70% is necessarily good when you look at the data that Fish, Wildlife, and Parks has collected for the Montana anglers, I just don't.

Jim Slattery: I can see that but that's the tradition that's been here.

Charlotte Cleveland: I say we need to stop it because the Montana angler is an important part of Montana.

Jim Slattery: Absolutely

Julie Eaton: What about the resident, what about those non-residents that buy property?

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Charlotte Cleveland: I'm not from here either but I'm saying it's the whole picture and I think that in the whole picture the data that Fish, Wildlife, and Parks presented said to me that in 2016, 2017 when they did their studies that this was the trend that was happening and that the Montana resident angler was being forced off their own rivers. I think that's sad.

Mark Odegard: Another interesting number which is the number of resident, non-resident (unintelligible) which is resident, the last survey I saw (unintelligible) to about 260,000 and about 180,000 non-residents so the analysis is impacted more by non-residents than the rest of the State.

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible) in especially compared to resident who's a non-resident every single day for years they have their ability so they have a number stamp so a stamp is a daily right?

Charlotte Cleveland: No it's associated with how much your, the license that you're buying. You go to buy them when you buy your 5 day license or 7, I don't know I always buy a season license so when you go buy your season license you buy your stamp at that point in time.

Melissa Glaser: What if you have it in your non-resident license?

Charlotte Cleveland: I don't know, that part if is I did not work out because folks from Fish, Wildlife, and Parks said that was an aspect of my plan that they could figure out. That they were capable of figuring out because I said I don't have that data. Because I ran my plan past some folks from Fish, Wildlife, and Parks and I said if this isn't workable, I want to know so I don't present it. You know if this is not something that you can in licensing handle I'd like to know so I don't present it.

Melissa Glaser: The non-resident is here for 3, 4 months of the year and they want to be able to fish any day that they want and they can do it they could purchase stamps for every single day (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: They wouldn't be doing that if they are here for 3 months wouldn't they be purchasing a season license?

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: Not based on users though it's user days that we're looking at right (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: It's a stamp that you buy it's associated with the length of time that your license is for. So you're not buying stamps when you buy a season license you're buying one stamp.

Melissa Glaser: So that doesn't, in my mind that doesn't even address the users days because you're looking at user days so how does that (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: I wasn't looking at user days I was looking at total use, total numbers.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Charlotte Cleveland: I could go with Don's plan of 100 what was your plan 100, I'm not stuck on my plan, I can go with Don's plan.

Don Skaar: That was equal angler days

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: Charlotte if I may, just bringing into context a little bit, something like that plan is like you're sacrificing people being to put food on the table for someone's angling experience. Just want to, that's where the rubber meets the road, that's when it's like and you're talking about residents.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: Tread very lightly

Charlotte Cleveland: No I think that any plan, a person suggested they do an economic evaluation of any plan that would come out of here is really important.

Jim Slattery: Yes

Charlotte Cleveland: Without a doubt because when I read this I wasn't sure that this was accurate either but I took it on face value that they had considered it but I think that an economic impact study should be done absolutely, on any plan because this is a big step.

Jim Slattery: I agree, and to resay what I did we're thinking about a whole communities' ability to put food on the table for somebodies angling pleasure, it's more than just one person it's a whole community.

Scott Vollmer: And Charlotte I get the perception that the Montana resident angler isn't important, I mean I'm one of them.

Jim Slattery: Yeah, so am I.

Scott Vollmer: So everyone in this room is one so obviously yes it's important. It reminds me, this argument reminds me a lot of the argument, different set of scenarios because it was a ballot initiative but it reminds me a lot of I161 if anyone remembers that which was the outfitter sponsored tags which largely went to non-residents and the people in the State of Montana agreed that we would get rid of the outfitter sponsored tags which led to a deficient of sales in non-resident tags for a number of years. We finally got to the point about 2 years ago now in the hunting world I believe if I'm right Tim, correct me if I'm wrong, 2 years ago where the amount of tags, the supply of tags, demand has finally met the supply of tags so in other words all those non-resident tags are not being bought up by non-residents. It took 10 years to get to that point and for a number of years there were a lot of tags going unfilled and a lot of dollars left out of the coffers of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks because of that. You heard me talk about it yesterday and I get it, the Montana resident is important is my whole thought on that is instead of providing absolute level and cutting it off at the head is make it a little bit more difficult for people to get these things. They do this on the Green River I think too I don't know the exact specifics and I think it's in the AIS and because of that less people want to do it. Let's figure out how many people that is, so what I'm getting at is with surveys in getting an idea how many people are using, is part of getting your tag is filling those things out with these are the amount of days I fished, this is the amount I'm out there, give it a couple of years, 2 years, it's a quick review and at the end of those 2 years let's see where that growth curve is. If that growth curve has continued in the same direction that it's at then boom let's chop it off because the whole educating the public about how to use the river number 1 and number 2 getting that censored data in our hand as to what happened the last 2 years will tell us what's happened to that growth curve. And if that growth curve has continued like this then yeah we've got to do something and do something now. But let's give it a couple of years to figure that out so that we don't severally debilitate some of those folks that Jim is talking about because we're not just talking about some (unintelligible) off Ennis we're talking about that guys family and he's important, that persons important, that woman is important as is the Montana resident angler

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Charlotte Cleveland: an economic impact study is what is needed regardless of the plan that comes out of here, and regardless of whether we finally come up with a plan or it goes back to Fish, Wildlife, and Parks or it goes somewhere else I think if you're dealing with the Madison River you need to have that economic impact study done so that you know or have a better idea of where that plan is going.

Scott Vollmer: And I don't want to give you the impression that I'm talking about hey let's kick the can down the road, because that is not the case at all. Is what I'm talking about is (unintelligible) little bit of time, collect a little bit for this and look where we're at and in 2 years time we're not going to ruin it in my opinion in that period of time. There could be things that happen because of disease but that's totally different and out of our concern and out of our realm but let's give it a little bit of time and see where we're at and take it from there and get back together, do this quick review that a lot of our plans have been talking about which I think is great and take a look at it again and see where we're at.

Don Skaar: So what additional information are you talking about that we aren't collecting now?

Scott Vollmer: It would be, Don it would be censures and what I mean by that is when a person gets their stamp what they have to do is they have to provide this information on what they did last year on the Madison River. I know it won't be 100% accurate because people forget or when they go fishing all lot of times they lie but we're going to know exactly how many days they fished and more importantly where they fished and match that up with whether they are the non-resident or the resident. So we're going to get an idea of exact angler days as close as we possibly can, that will I think be a little bit more accurate than the current, not that it's a bad system, not that it's the worst system I should say but a little bit more accurate than the current angler survey, biannual angler survey. On a year to year basis, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom those data points, figure out exactly where we're at whether it's 200,000 it dropped to 180,000 and boom it shot up to 240,000 oh my god let's do something now. And re-evaluate the plan at that point. It's not 10 years down the road I don't want to do that, that's too long. But a couple years down the road, do it. First year, I like what some other people say about first year you know is same technical errors, things that Tim did with Bitterroot, great idea and 2nd year formal review take a good look at this thing, how does it actually affecting a, social conflicts, b, overcrowding, kind of a and b go together.

Melissa Glaser: I think also by putting that stamp on the river requirements (unintelligible) you're (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: So when anyone buys a fishing license and wants to fish the Madison they get a free stamp and then we'd have their contact information basically is that the way that would work?

Scott Vollmer: Well no I mean really in my mind the way it would work is if this would work and I don't know how it work because my opinion on it is I don't want to prescribe those specifics to FWP who's very, very good at doing those specifics. I want them to do it, I want a philosophy in my mind. And the philosophy generally is you sit down, you take a little bit of that persons time, honestly, we should take some of their time. They owe it to the river okay whether they're resident or non-resident, a little bit of their time to get educated about certain things that a lot of people aren't really aware about and a lot of that is river etiquette. So that could be like a video component. There's some really great things out there and I suggest if anyone really wants to take a look at this there's the Nimtz Society puts out and they did this for Colorado, and there was a lot of anti-fisherman, anti-hunting backlash in Colorado and they did this informational stuff. They called it how to hunt and it's kind of corny but they did it and it really has worked and impacted in Colorado at the (unintelligible) Convention there was a presentation on it and it was fascinating. You can go to their website and it's on there. And what they found through their survey data is the backlash against hunters and fishermen in the State from other users, again we're talking about other user groups. People that hunt, or people that hike, people that just want to use outdoor recreation has decreased significantly because of this positive campaign out there. Education is a positive campaign. And we're not going to have everyone, we're not going to hit everybody out there, it's impossible, it's the silver bullet that doesn't exist that Mike keeps talking about. But there are a lot of users out there in my opinion that just don't quite get it and if we just make them aware of it by watching this video for 10 or 15 minutes, answer a couple of questions just to make sure that they actually watched the video and then giving us some data about how much did you use the Madison River. All that is required to get a stamp, and that boom, immediately goes into a data base, again I don't want to get to specific about it because I think the agencies in charge of that are a lot better than me and can bring in a lot of partners in other places, (unintelligible) maybe helping, collaborate and figure out the best way to put that out there.

Don Skaar: So would that, so the survey would that be collecting information that would be metrics then for restrictions or changes there after?

Scott Vollmer: Possibly

Michael Bias: I thought of someone that, you know we talked early on, the first couple of days about I hate to say this how this is a blueprint for other rivers but if you have some sort of Madison stamp on your license or you know the Blackfoot or the whoever or the Yellowstone starts to go through this process for (unintelligible) on their river that one's already in place and now you're starting to know how many dudes are on the Madison and how many are on the Yellowstone and (unintelligible). So we have art contest for Madison River Fishing Stamp.

Jim Slattery: I'd like to maybe suggest something off of what Scott was saying, you know how about if we, when you get this, your Madison River stamp when you guy your license there's a trigger in the processing that Jack he bought the Madison River stamp so then we know

just by buying the license who has it and then from there maybe we could get some immediate information where do you, when you buy the license where do you expect to fish you know and have like a map 1, 2, 3, or 4 just like, **(can't recreate the sound)** they could put that in while their doing the license. At least we could capture that right then and there because sometimes if you send out these surveys guys only been there once he's not going to, you're not going to get that information.

Julie Eaton: So this is a mini hunter education, I mean we've been doing that for years.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: boat sales I'm sure have been from what I can see have been big
(unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: We haven't talked specifics and again I don't really want to get into that too, too much but I think Melissa has similar not exactly the same and we haven't together talked specifics of that but she might have some ideas on specifics that might be better and really illuminate how this could possibly take place.

Melissa Glaser: Using a video on the hunter education part of it would be a little bit restrictive.

Mike Mitchell: It's a tradeoff

Melissa Glaser: that could be good in some ways but if the person is just going to use the Madison River for one day that might be a problem, as far as the surveys for finding out where they fished would be easy enough as in the computers and stuff (unintelligible) it's pretty simple, it's the education part of it I don't know that I want to make that a requirement to getting your stamp.

Jim Slattery: Getting a stamp.

Julie Eaton: I'm glad you said that because then that made me think you know I learned all my fishing etiquette from my dad and from other people and then for (unintelligible) all of that but there might be something you're not learning from their dad so this education isn't just for the Madison, it's for every river, that's the dad or the mom so (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: So you're talking about it being voluntary

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: somewhere out there from Fish, Wildlife, and Parks and the community however it's out there (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: Classic line from day on is for me personally with that right there is I would prefer it otherwise but I can live with that.

Michael Bias: Along these lines I like the idea I think it's appropriate. I think of it that the shop that's in the morning trying to get 20 clients out the door buying licenses

Scott Vollmer: Yep I thought about that too just as Melissa was

Michael Bias: It's a, no it's not the same as hunting you go to the shop in the morning and buy the hunting licenses and go out. And etiquette you know it's not a good deal (unintelligible) but it would immediately add to displacement I know coming out of Dillon, some of those shops, you know but you go into Madison Mike you go to (unintelligible) Big Hole and so it's instantaneously displacement which might be good, I don't know.

Jim Slattery: You can buy your license on line right?

Charlotte Cleveland: Yes

Michael Bias: A lot of people do and you know (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: so maybe a suggestion would be to have that video oh, you want to buy a license and you click on to it and there's that video you know and then at the bottom it says skip but you know the first thing that they see is that video and they think well I got to watch this video to get there and kind of

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: as Melissa was saying that and Mike now too is unintended consequences and for a lot of the fly shops for me personally with a lot of my clients I get them the link to the FWP website well in advance and I also, I highlight it this way is we're going to save some time the first day and get more fishing time if you purchase your license in advance and make sure you bring it with you. And the compliance rate on that for me personally I don't do a ton of trips myself but probably if I had to estimate it at about 80%. 20% of the time you've got to stop at the fly shop along the way but there are a lot of people like Mike said is trying to get 20 guys out the door

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: it's a big income driver

Mark Odegard: Or you could at least give them a brochure.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Tim Aldrich: When all this is said and done the responsibility that the policy in the rule making what we're talking about here it says the purpose of these rules is to provide guidance to

the Commission as appointed Citizen Advisory Committees in management of recreational rivers. These rules seek to promote management or river recreational advice a full variety of quality recreation for a diverse public (unintelligible) natural resources (unintelligible). So I mean there's still a very sociological kind of a thing that's talking about what kind of experience are we talking about trying to preserve (unintelligible) and I think that's you know we can try to chase at the numbers but I just don't think numbers are going to get it. We do need better information than what we have right now but don't look for the magic bullet to just drop out of the sky because we have better information. Still it's some tough judgments, valued judgments about what people expect that we can (unintelligible) this is representative of (unintelligible) policy is of the agency of the State (unintelligible). I just want to (unintelligible) we are a Citizens Advisory Committee to Ennis. We may have been appointed through a statute rather than a rule but we are a Citizens Advisory Committee in function providing something or recommendations (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: So I'll, I don't want to mess with the conversation but I do want to make sure let's go back to Charlotte

Charlotte Cleveland: I'm done

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: conversation has proceeded from there. I just wanted to make sure that what you were thinking didn't get lost along the way.

Charlotte Cleveland: No

Mike Mitchell: No? Okay

Melissa Glaser: So may I guess I think I know what you're going to ask some of these other plans are showing a little bit tighter numbers and incorporating something from Charlotte's plan (unintelligible) day in the walk wade section satisfied without having that entire non-residents stamp in there would that satisfy the resident angler, residents in your

Charlotte Cleveland: I have no idea

Jim Slattery: I think it would increase the displacement on the Madison.

Melissa Glaser: I think so too.

Charlotte Cleveland: I'd have to know which plan you're talking about and specifically see where it fits in, I just can't say off the top of my head.

Melissa Glaser: 4, 6, or 8 (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: I also have question about 4, 6 and 8 too and I would like the same opportunity that you guys had to discuss those plans as well because I have questions about whether you're monetizing days and it's not clear to me. I have very similar questions you know. I couldn't say which one it would fit into because I still don't know the details on those plans.

Scott Vollmer: We'd love to talk about that too because we've been talking about it for a while.

Mike Mitchell: So to that point Charlotte it's worth thinking about so maybe you're not talking about a particular alternative?

Charlotte Cleveland: Oh, I thought that's what you were saying.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah well so I don't want you to anchor on anyone of these alternatives but just the general thoughts on her question if we did this would it improve things from the residents point of view and we can talk about that component.

Charlotte Cleveland: If I'm looking at the data that was collected a resident's day would help the resident angler. Maybe they wouldn't be displaced as badly as they are being displaced, 70%.

Michael Bias: Can I ask where that 70% comes from?

Charlotte Cleveland: It's out of the data that um

Michael Bias: I would (unintelligible) specific on (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: I can show you because I

Michael Bias: That would be good (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: Oh you want to do it right now?

Michael Bias: Oh, no go ahead

Charlotte Cleveland: I'm done, I'm really done.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: I think that number may have been, yeah the residents who said they fished the Madison less frequently now or something like that.

Charlotte Cleveland: Yeah it was

Michael Bias: So my question is this, if we're having this historical displacement how are we still climbing from 180,000 to 207,000 in 2017 and not figure like 240,000 last year?

Like you said don't we wish to go to Utah or Idaho? If those, if that demographic older resident person local to the Madison if they're that dissatisfied (unintelligible) clearly it's not showing up in the increasing rate of increased use. Do we really need to worry about that dude that's angry and pissed off and isn't fishing the Madison anymore because I mean comparison this steep rate of increase is probably more important (unintelligible). And are we worrying about the relics that maybe we should be placing that amount of emphasis on that's my question. Do the (unintelligible) these displaced residents. I can't figure like bigfoot or the unicorn man I haven't seen them there are plenty of residents out there fishing.

Don Skaar: That's because they're not there.

Charlotte Cleveland: They're not there.

Don Skaar: They're displaced. I mean I think the survey suggests it's more than just a couple relics wandering around. That's pretty high percentages. I don't know what the numbers really are but

Michael Bias: That's why I, that's my point. There's some percentages that were bandied about already that turns out it's 43 people. I mean if you was we have 1650 (unintelligible) that can counter the 43. It's just my point. Where's the 70% coming from? Is that the number we worry about when we're talking about 207,000 users 35% of them are residents. Just a question (unintelligible). But anyway, keep going.

Don Skaar: I thought that survey was really good from the standpoint that it's pretty internally consistent so for example the people with more years of experience are more dissatisfied for example in residents more so than non-residents so I think that suggests it's more than just a few people out there.

Michael Bias: Well I'm

Scott Vollmer: If you guys want to follow along here I'm getting the numbers and what I came up with 20% and I'll talk you through why if you look at this survey so if everyone goes to the 2016, 2017 surveys, please I encourage you, I did this quick. If I'm incorrect correct me. So it's page 41.

Michael Bias: You're in the appendix

Scott Vollmer: Yeah I'm in the weeds now

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: I'm in appendix 41 it's broken down between the number of respondents between resident and non-resident you can see that at the top of page 41. So you take 1,335 residents, see that, n=1335. Question number 3 asks whether you were fishing use of the upper Madison River has changed any over time remember residents are in blue. So 30% of the people

answered that their fishing use has changed which then toggles them down to the next question so let's take 1,335 and multiply by 30% you get 400.5 people move down to the next question. So the next question 4, 400 people are answering that question and 67.4% said first thing I now fish the upper Madison River less frequently. So let's multiply 400 by .674 and that gives you a total of 269 people say that they measured the Madison, or they fished the Madison River less frequently. We'll round it up to 270 because it's 269.9 so 270 divided by remember our (unintelligible) was 1335 at the beginning that puts you at 20.2%.

Michael Bias: Thank you Scott

Scott Vollmer: You're welcome

Michael Bias: That's the point of whether you take percentages of percentages of percentages which is I mean this whole appendix is that. (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: Not that 20% isn't important

Don Skaar: Well of course the math you did Scott of course ignores the other portion even those that say their use has not changed on the river there's still a fair amount of dissatisfaction. Numbers of those that

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: specifically to Charlotte saying 70%

Don Skaar: If I just want to find out

Scott Vollmer: We can go through that exercise with the other ones too if you wanted to. I get what you're saying. I just was not specific.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mike Mitchell: The one thing I'll throw out, I'm sorry Scott, I'm totally in (unintelligible) but also numbers won't make this decision (unintelligible) okay it's the values of the people involved so one thing I think I caution against letting numbers steam role values so the numbers are important to provide context but it's the values of the different stakeholders at the table that?

Michael Bias: But Mike I hear that and that goes both ways. We're saying oh it's 1335 there, those guys (unintelligible) they're saying it's 70%, it's 70% so they're using numbers, (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: I know but it's to (unintelligible) value those numbers. People value those numbers differently and that's okay

Michael Bias: Right

Mike Mitchell: You need to go off of how do you value those numbers. Other people might value different numbers or see those same numbers in a different way. So again let's, numbers are important we can be talking about them, they provide context but they don't, they aren't going to drive the decision. It's how the folks at the table value their represented, how people value the numbers, shared understandings, that is going to make the decision.

Don Skaar: You know I don't know maybe you all realize this and maybe it's not that important in the broad scheme of things but you know when we do surveys like this we don't do it just because we want to pick on someone. That's our stewardship responsibility is to try to be equitable about this so that's what we're trying to do here and we don't want to leave people behind. I mean if it's just one or two individuals that's a different thing but this identifies a group that's being affected by current trends on the river so to us if we can do something about that either reversing that or making sure it didn't get worse that's what we're really interested in doing.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: shows displacement

Michael Bias: But if that number is way low out of 207,000, 243 people my point is how much emphasis do we put on that particular (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: that's a number of a subset of a small survey that was done. We didn't survey all 204,000 people

Michael Bias: Yeah now we know, that's my other point is maybe we should be asking 207,000 users what they thought.

Mike Mitchell: So let's move on. I think we have a better, I have better understanding about the number than I did starting out and again it's about me. So we haven't heard from Lauren yet. Let's hear from Lauren.

Lauren Wittorp: Yeah so when I look at this I go back to constantly what I've all along thought that FWP, they were the experts when they came out with their plan last April. They used everything available to them not only from now but over time. They used patterns that have developed over time making consistently (unintelligible). I think we've heard a lot from Travis and Dave tipping points and biological triggers don't work in this situation and it'll be too late. And even when Travis points out to me when thinking about economies. Thinking about what if we let a decline happen what happens to the economy then. And the impact of if you're factoring whirling disease, what happened to the river and the economies then. And so remembering that FWP, they are the experts, they're the ones day in day out they're the , they have degrees in this. So try and remember that and along with Charlottes discussion of making

sure you know everybody has access to the river. When they came up with these ideas for instance, the walk wade sections I think it's incredibly important to remember that, that isn't a new idea. People have been asking for that since the 50's. People will, it's a pattern over time of that's what people want. That's what I consistently hear people saying they want. And I don't think the original April rule was perfect. I think that there were compromises that could have been made. I think yesterday Mike, Don and I had discussions of where those could happen in other things that could be done. I think making sure that all people have access. We talk about comparing things to hunting. There are areas of public land that you can access by a 4-wheeler to go hunting, there's areas where it's hiking only even if you can't necessarily, I can't hike to some of those places but it's there for everybody to enjoy. And I think it's important to remember that in this world, in the fishing world as well that there are people who want wade access without boats around. I think it's decreased a lot of people's experience on this river. I think it's dangerous as Travis said yesterday. The growth is not sustainable and to remember that the fishery cannot continue on and not be impacted. I think when I hear things of separating out giving non-residents of giving them an exception and making it pay for play and allowing, if you can pay for an outfitter it would exempt you from having a tag. I don't think we should ever go down the road of pay for play. In the same regards as I don't think outfitters days should become valued. I think that takes away from the Montana (unintelligible) able to become an outfitter and that's why you know you're talking about yesterday, I don't think we should cap SRP's. I think if you cap other use it can solve that problem. The same with the rest and rotation, I think it's not needed if we can cap it in another way. People could go where they wanted. It's important to me that people, the number the fishery is protected as well that people have access to their type of fishing. I think that's most of my concerns in here. Other things I mean we've heard from the beginning FWP's budgets, I don't know where a lot of the money would come from by a lot of these things. That concerns me, they don't have the money and a lot of the things in 2012 were rejected because of that. So I'm hesitant if anything that requires new funding. But those are all my concerns.

Mike Mitchell: Questions for Lauren? Hearing none.

Jim Slattery: I'd say well said.

Mark Odegard: One thing we could really ask questions, the latest numbers for wade versus boat 2013, published in 2015 one of the authors is right over here, 2013 is 54% shore anglers, 30% boat and 14% both, 2% ice.

Don Skaar: I knew we had those numbers.

Mark Odegard: Interestingly it's almost identical to (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: That was just broken out by the Madison drainage right?

Mark Odegard: Yeah

Don Skaar: Mostly Madison River but not exclusively.

Mark Odegard: So and if you want I can e-mail (unintelligible). One of those 108 things I downloaded.

Mike Mitchell: So my question for the group is this has been very substantive discussion. How does it lead to thinking about a decision? Are these alternatives that we can (unintelligible) based on what we've been talking about? They don't have to be like one alternative, (unintelligible) they're real differences of opinion. Let's capture them and see how they play out. So I think you had brought up at one point that you know if you see red somewhere in there doesn't that mean there's some tweaking we can do to address that red to some of these substantive issues. Is it as simple as well let's modify alternative in this way. So of the issues that have been most of the subject of discussion where there is disagreement, I want to be clear about this not disagreement as in who's right and who's wrong, disagreement in values okay where (unintelligible) it would be great to come up with some sort of compromise or something in the middle between these disagreeing values. I heard, so we talked about defining stretches for wading (unintelligible) talking about what are the other things we're seeing a clash in values that are making this difficult. Things that we might be able to address with our alternatives.

Jim Slattery: I think yeah I think on the local economy

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Charlotte Cleveland: I think monetizing days

Michael Bias: I think you're right we haven't got there we talked about walk wade, we talked about resident, non-resident and capping all users in some manner. You know we had some management options proposed by Tim and management options proposed by Mel that we haven't started detailing yet and those, well the common thread in those is how do you manage commercial use do we do it to and this has already been put out there capping SRP's. Is that, how do you do it, will that be in my mind is that they way to manage it, capping days or is it some not days or trips. Do you do it that way or do you do it the way Tim and I were talking yesterday evening about trips per day per outfitter is that the way to do it. So in my mind we talked a lot about some of these (unintelligible) options except for those SRP's days. Lauren touched on not capping SRPs so those management alternatives options give you different ways of management the commercial users which we haven't gotten to yet.

Mike Mitchell: So one thing I'm curious about the capping thing, I'm coming from a place of (unintelligible) what objectives does that discussion affect potentially.

Michael Bias: Commercial anglers

Scott Vollmer: 1D

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: 7

Julie Eaton: 1A

Michael Bias: 1A, 1B, mostly all of 1.

Mike Mitchell: Which of those alternatives up there actually, do any of them talk about caps or approaches to?

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mike Mitchell: Which ones

Charlotte Cleveland: 1, 8

Jim Slattery: 4, 7, and 8 that's for a non-resident cap, that's user cap

Charlotte Cleveland: 6 caps commercial days

Mike Mitchell: 6 caps commercial

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: 6 doesn't cap commercial

Charlotte Cleveland: It says cap commercial days

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: I'm sorry Mel

Melissa Glaser: Upon prescribed

Charlotte Cleveland: It still caps

Scott Vollmer: That does it at the beginning

Charlotte Cleveland: Pardon me

Scott Vollmer: When the plan gets implemented there's no cap, (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: So we have some of these alternatives deal with this idea of capping in ways that we're approaching and I'm still trying to figure out which ones.

Melissa Glaser: 4, 6, 7, and 8

Mike Mitchell: 6, 7, and 8

Melissa Glaser: 4, 6, 7, and 8

Mike Mitchell: And number 1 as well? So I'm trying to see how it's playing out in terms of the values. Those

Michael Bias: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Hold on, hold on.

Michael Bias: It's challenged

Mike Mitchell: I know it's challenged. So I'm trying to see for those that have some form, some approach to capping what affects those caps are having in the satisfaction of the different groups that could potentially be affected by the caps. So if somebodies really losing by imposing a cap if there's a form of capping how is it playing out where it's really negatively affecting somebody.

Michael Bias: I think you got to look at (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Okay so not just the satisfaction ones? Which ones?

Michael Bias: So like if you look at 4 lot of green, 7 lot of green

Mike Mitchell: and these greens are based on caps?

Michael Bias: They're two different management alternatives to manage commercial use.

Mike Mitchell: Okay and they're playing out in which objectives Mike?

Michael Bias: Like for example alternative 4 and alternative 7 get at managing commercial use in 2 different ways. 4 and 7 are two of the ones I know just

Mike Mitchell: Okay so yeah but which objectives are those different approaches the capping affected down here?

Michael Bias: 8

Mike Mitchell: 8

Michael Bias: 8 for (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Okay, so

Michael Bias: 8 and 11

Mike Mitchell: minimize privatization

Michael Bias: all of 9. They're a whole point away from each other.

Mike Mitchell: So what are we learning by those different approaches to managing to caps. So if those alternatives have different approaches to managing caps what are we learning about those different approaches and how they're playing out here?

Don Skaar: Well 8 for instance looks like that's sort of designed to be controlled over all use whereas 4 for instance is more just trying to control the composition of the commercial use so there's some

Michael Bias: Yes, yes and no, for example, alternative 8 rule 2 the second part cap commercial days at 2017 levels. If you don't, how do you do that right? If you don't look , 4 details how that's done based on which outfitters being displaced. But 8 states that but it doesn't detail how to do that.

Julie Eaton: It's the Committee's job

Michael Bias: Huh?

Julie Eaton: It's the Committee's job to figure that out.

Charlotte Cleveland: So whose alternative is 8? Okay so you're answering his question.

Mike Mitchell: So you're talking about 4A Mike right and the difference in how the caps are set up between those two?

Michael Bias: No, Don brought up 4A but there similar in stating lets cap commercial days at 2016 levels and I'm saying that alternative 4 details out how you go how to do that and alternative 8 doesn't. Alternative 8 just says hey you should do this.

Mike Mitchell: I'm still trying to understand how caps are making a difference up here or the different approaches to caps. So you know you said if there was some uncertainty we need to have a discussion about different ways that we could

Julie Eaton: Some are really restrictive some leave it up to the Committee to figure it out, some are very specific, I mean some cause a lot of displacement so that would make that cap maybe not as okay. Some are specific and

Mike Mitchell: But all those different forms of capping are not captured in the current alternatives?

Michael Bias: Only some of the (unintelligible) like 4 details how to do that and Tim's I think is 7, 7 has another variation of how to do that and 8 just says hey we should do this but doesn't have a plan.

Mike Mitchell: So details would help when you say hey we need to do this.

Michael Bias: Oh I think that's what we're down to.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah okay cool.

Melissa Glaser: The other thing on 7 they have, it's not detailed on how to do it but in addition to those caps there's also closing up river so (unintelligible) so it's hard to just compare based on the bottom numbers that's changing a path when you have something else that's a really major point for one of us sitting here is going to affect those numbers.

Mark Odegard: As a non-outfitter it's very difficult for me to decide among these alternatives. Yesterday Julie started educating me. I just don't know enough commercially to set the cap and then tell a commercial user to devise a system seems like that's the way you would want to do it.

Jim Slattery: Yeah, I would agree. We have 4 acronyms here so, we have the director (unintelligible) we should be listening to

Michael Bias: Well let me just give you an example of, an example. So for example when you say cap commercial usage. Commercial days at 2017 levels that's the overall, that's what we're going to do and then we say well there's different ways to do that one is historic use right well that's what it implies we're going to, whatever you did in 2017 that's what you get but Lauren and Don and Tim say oh we don't want to monetize the permit system and then we're like oh, how do we cap historic use at 2017 without monetizing each outfitters permit. I don't know. There's models out there that do it but what is our concern.

Scott Vollmer: The model for not monetizing permits we actually currently have. It's in our commercial use rules and it follows the same as the Forest Service concessionaire. There's no property right that transfers. That's not monetizing yet we all know that Big Hole Beaverhead days gets sold. It's not the days that are sold. What happens is you transfer your business and the new permittee or buyer then gets the new permit with the allocated days transferred in whole.

Julie Eaton: That's not the whole story though.

Scott Vollmer: Right but that is not according to the commercial use rules is there's no property right that transfers so

Michael Bias: And I'll give you another example if you say cap SRP's right if you take 203 SRP's from 2017 and then the Commission says that's it we're not having any more well guess what you just monetized that permits because there is only 203 available.

Julie Eaton: And that's what (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: and then you go well I'm getting out of outfitting. I want to transfer my SRP how do I do that one way is hey that things worth, how many days are tied to that or what's it good for so kind of my point it we're trying to build a system without monetizing it but monetizing it is almost an artifact building the system. But there are ways around it like Tim's management option for limiting overall use across reaches is based on launches per outfitter per day. Where and it doesn't cap SRP's, it doesn't give any body any particular amount of days it just says you can't launch more than 10 boats on this stretch on this day and so that's another way if you got it. And there are issues that are worth talking about (unintelligible) plans for example if we get \$10.00 per day per outfitter over 200 outfitters that's 200,000 days.

Tim Aldrich: That's why I offered (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: But we haven't discussed it yet so they're like Mark said there's he doesn't understand the details of the management options and each one of those management options is a variation we captured under each of those different

Mike Mitchell: They are captured? Because I thought they weren't.

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) I'm just saying

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Jim Slattery: I can, so what do the outfitters see if there was a, if there is going to be a cap imposed how would the outfitters like to see that done?

Michael Bias: That's the million dollar question right?

Mike Mitchell: I think he just asked it.

Jim Slattery: Yeah, well you know

Michael Bias: Well so no I (unintelligible) do there yet. It started out if there's a cap are we going to cap outfitter days per day or are we going to cap launches per day, are we going to cap SRP's and I can tell you capping SRP's doesn't do anything.

Jim Slattery: Well that's why, I guess the question I'm asking is how would you like, how would the outfitters like to see that role out? What is their vision?

Michael Bias: You know it depends on what you guys impose. If you come out and say we're capping SRP's we don't okay cap SRP's

Jim Slattery: Well I think what we're saying is we're leaving it up to you what would, what I'm asking is I'm leaving it up to you, you're going to make the decision on how do you want to see that, how does the outfitters want to see this rolled out if we have to imply a cap?

Michael Bias: Cap on what (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: Cap on use, a cap on use.

Michael Bias: Okay and here's, I could inform you, let me just inform you that a cap on use back to issue of 2018 not 18, I have 17,

Mark Odegard: and in a year 19

Jim Slattery: Again how, what is your best outcome if we have to cap users?

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: it's some version of 4 or some version of 8 (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: I think what Jim's asking is, if you were King Mike what would you do?

Jim Slattery: Exactly

Michael Bias: If I was King they would chop my head off.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: the constituency I mean you are the executive director, what are you hearing the most of, what, really what do you think?

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) I'm just going to come out and say I asked you guys the third day to let me present all of that information to you and within 5 seconds I had 3 Committee members saying no you're not the expert we don't want to hear from you. We'll hear from Fish, Wildlife, and Parks.

Jim Slattery: Well maybe

Michael Bias: so my feelings were hurt

Jim Slattery: well get over it and maybe that's the cause.

Michael Bias: I then at the beginning it became, this consensus thing and then the whole Committee said no we don't want to hear from them.

Jim Slattery: I think it was at that time I think, that time in the

Michael Bias: I would be happy to go through some version of what I did, all the (unintelligible) members at some point and talk about how, and bring in stuff from what we learned on VH2, what we learned on West Fork and just I promise it's not a, it's only the 2,000, it's only the commercial user numbers, it's no intended bias in any of that, in any presentations

Jim Slattery: Do you have a plan, I mean I guess it comes down to that do you guys have a plan, what it is?

Michael Bias: Well what I want to do though I want to educate the Committee on aspects of the plan

Jim Slattery: That's fine

Michael Bias: So then when we're talking about capping SRP's and I say something like capping SRP's that wouldn't work, you understand why it doesn't work. Because over the last 10 years by adding SRP's we added 25 SRP's since 2011 and that's not (unintelligible) increasing (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Here's the thing I think we should do. The whole process has been let's take and put it on the screen and that will be the focus of the conversation and that's how we learn (unintelligible). And so if there are different approaches to capping with different ramifications let's put them on the screen and that will be the subject for the discussion and so people have questions like I don't understand it or somebody says Mike what do you mean by that okay then you can explain to everybody but let's put something concrete up on the screen. So we're coming up on lunch time. I want to make sure I'm not missing something. So caps need to be discussed. Wades, wading sections need to be discussed. What are the other sticky points?

Melissa Glaser: Resident days

Mike Mitchell: Resident days, okay

Jim Slattery: And a business, the economy, impact on the economy.

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Julie Eaton: The objectives

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Don Skaar: I'd throw in cap on all use should be on the table too not just commercial users.

Mike Mitchell: Sure let's just say caps.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mike Mitchell: Okay, so there are different approaches to capping. During lunch, let's do a working lunch, people really want to engage in conversation on any of those okay, let's keep that conversation going. After lunch where we want to be, where I'd suggest the Committee should be is okay, let's put some alternatives that include these different ideas up on the screen. And we could just do it for a handful of these objectives. We don't have to completely redefine alternatives. So these things that are the sticking point, let's evaluate those things but we can

have different approaches to solving the problem so we can evaluate as a group which one might work best. Okay?

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible) I've had this discussion myself a number of times and it's the tools you put in place basically that you can talk about most meaningfully when you want to talk about allocation or whatever you talk, the next step is that tradeoffs because nothing comes without a tradeoff. (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHISPERING CAN'T UNDERSTAND TIM

Tim Aldrich: boil it down we don't get clogged (unintelligible) until we try to make a specific analysis, what are the tradeoffs.

Mike Mitchell: Okay, let's break for lunch, keep the discussions going we'll pick up after lunch on the specific alternatives for each of these ideas that we want to evaluate. Different approaches to capping, different approaches to SRP's et cetra.

COMMITTEE BREAK FOR LUNCH

Mike Mitchell: Okay got everybody back so we had the group discussing the issues of capping that we left off with and so the group decided it would be a good idea for Mike to give a presentation on issues associated with that before we go on with discussing how alternatives may or may not involve caps. So did I say that right group? Okay, so, Mike you're up.

Michael Bias: You're all good with this, I appreciate it thank you.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mark Odegard: You want to pull the blinds?

Mike Mitchell: You're on the spot Mike

Michael Bias: So thanks for this, this is just a little preface when the Negotiated Rule Making Committee members were selected, FOAM, Fishing Outfitters Association of Montana put together a series of listening meetings like town hall meetings and this is essentially what I presented to our members and (unintelligible) holders with the format of where we were going and then the options we might need to think about. And so those options talk about exactly what we were talking about today. (unintelligible) allocations. (unintelligible), I just want to say the time line of the NRC we all know that and the process, when we had our meetings. And then I started with I call them tenants of the April plan so what happened in the April plan with what was, what the Fish, Wildlife, and Parks put in there as far as management options and I talked a little bit about why the plan was rejected. So the first thing I talked about was its identified not as a biological problem but a social problem we know that and my interpretations of what Fish, Wildlife, and Parks want was oh, look here's my pointer, no monetization of the SRP. And this comes from, I think it's even in the EA. They wanted to allow for some business growth and

flexibility for the outfitters to plan trips with groups coming in and groups going out and the like. The other thing they talk about is capping the number of SRP's at 2016, 2017 levels, 17 because it was addressed in 2018 and at that time it's 2,000 or 2,000, 203 commercial outfitted users have SRP's so 203 in 2017. And they want to incorporate some opportunity for entry and they talked about having retired permits put into some sort of SRP lottery pool and then at any time right, at any time they can reduce the number of permits, the number SRP permits. That's all in the April EA. Some more tenants in their plan they discussed, oh here's one of our management options right. Rest and rotation so rest is your fishing, you break it into 7 reaches, the Madison in this case. You break the Madison into 7 reaches and at any one day of the week you're not allowing commercial use on that stretch. That reach is being rested and then the next one, the next day is rested and so on so it's a rest and rotation and that's where that name derives from. They also set this idea of a peak season and that was between 16th of June and the 30th of September and we'll talk about why those dates are important. And then the other thing they did and this gets into Tim's alternatives are set the number of launches per outfitter per day as a way to manage or their thought was to manage overall outfitted use. And so they weren't doing it through allocation they were doing through launches per outfitter per day.

Tim Aldrich: Mike it wasn't really to cap commercial use. It was (unintelligible) needs taken in the EA was capping (unintelligible) use.

Michael Bias: Okay, I said (unintelligible) so there's different ways to control at distribution and we could cut it off, we could slam it down, we could do all kinds of things, depending on how you do it some sort of management will be applied for that distribution. All right, some more tenants, no commercial use from Grey Cliff to the Jefferson, we talked some about that, closing the upper primitive designation at Grey Cliff to the Jefferson, glass containers and in the plan they specified that there is no management option to control over all use. So that's what happened. One of the things and I want you to remember this, keep this in the back of your head, this is straight out of the EA, we seen this graph a number of times already and that's overall use numbers climbing from 90,000 use days in 2011 to 180,000 on this graph, 207,000 days in 2017 on the upper. Quake Lake to Ennis Lake, the outfitter use there is on this graph are this little red line right there. It's not even to the bottom so (unintelligible) 14,000 to 22,000 user days is what the outfitted use was in that time line. The other thing the April plan did that's important for us as we talk about this is they define trip. They defined all this use as trips and really it's we take 2 people in our boat so 22,000 use days divided by 2, we had 11,000 trips in 2017. So there's nothing new, none of my numbers these are all Fish, Wildlife, and Parks numbers. I'm trying to point. So a couple of things. I talked about 203 commercial outfitters under the SRP program and that was in 2017 of those 175 outfitters conducted 1 trip or more on the Madison. Okay so way up there ah, here you go, 2017 175 outfitters made trips, in 2011 it was 150 so we went 150 SRP outfitter holders to 175. How's my time? I said I'd be not more than 15 minutes but 20 minutes. The other thing I asked them in 2011 so the first year the SRP program was implemented was the most anyone outfitter did was 451 trips and then 550 day

trips, 600 trips, 686, 796, and then in 2017 we had an outfitter, on outfitter do 1,012 trips. Now this table is right out of the EA okay and so when Andrew sent me the EA I was looking at it I was like, dude where's all this growth coming from. Right, (unintelligible), where is this growth coming from. I don't get how did it get that high and I couldn't decipher that from this graph. I mean you kind of can if you look at you get these numbers going up, these numbers going up so there is growth across from here to there. Right these guys are jumping (unintelligible). So what Andrew did was break it down to 1 in 24 trips; 25 to 49 trips; 50 to 99 trips et. cetera. Okay so that's number of trips across the top and then their frequency and I said man, what's the, you got to scrap off some rust here, what's the median number of trips, these 200 outfitters did and he says ah, 22. Dude 22 trips, so the median number out of 100 outfitters, 100 outfitters did 22 trips or less. That's pretty important so out of 200 people 100 of them are running only 22 trips or less right there. So this graph is already skewed right. Well where's the detail in these numbers? What's going on down there? I didn't know where that was. I don't like looking at stuff like this particularly so what I did I said Cheryl, Travis, can I get the Madison SRP number? And they sent me the data. It's like excellent, so I have all this, I had all the outfitters, not their names, their number and the number of trips they did for every year in the SRP. So 2011, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, all this number, all this graph is setting up the outfitters in size order. So when you're taking pictures in kindergarten and you had to get in line, I was always on this end, I was the short guy and lining them up in size order by year. So if we look 2011 450 trips whatever, 550 trips, 600 trips, 700 trips later, all led to 1,012. So every outfitter is on here by the number of trips they did. And when you look at this a couple of things happen. One is this is a very almost flat line and then it gets really steep right, so this is this, this is where all the increase in growth is coming from on this end. Not over here. So as we added more outfitters this is the other thing, here's 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, all the way up to 2017, as we add more outfitters we're not jumping the graph. We're not you know it's not very big by adding new outfitters it's still really, really flat. The other thing I did was okay you remember back in high school you took your SAT's or you go into grad school you take GRE's or whatever standardized test, they always put you into percentages, and I was in the like the 20th percentile and I thought that was really good. That's really not so good. Because the 20th percentile is, you're only better than 20% of the people taking the test. So I said how's another way to look at this, is distribution of outfitters through the year and try to identify where this, where all this growth is coming from, I looked at percentiles. And so the 25th percentile 2011, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and then number of trips so it's the 25th percentile for any year was 7 trips. Right there. So what is this graph doing. This is, man these are really flat, really flat. So this is 25, I can't read that, I don't know it's like 40, 50 is right here, 70, 75 and then so this is I think 90 and 95 percentile. So what this shows you right off the bat is that most of the increase, increasing rate of increase is coming from very few number of outfitters, a very low percentage, 10% are responsible for most of the growth. It's not, I don't want to get into the whole, oh there they problem, they're not the problem. We're way down here 22,000 days, but the majority from year to year 50% of the outfitters are running 50% run 22 trips or less. 50% so that's right here 22 trips or less running 50% and that doesn't

change. 2011 it was still 20 some trips, 2017 is 22. This is 80th percentile. 66 trips so 80% of the outfitters are running 68 trips is what it came out to and that number is really flat from one year to the next. It's when we get up into this, it's really last 15, 20 outfitters where that growth has really happened over the last couple of years. Okay so let me go back, on other thing, most of the outfitters are running few number of trips. 100 outfitters are running 22 trips or less that's 2,200 trips all year. So 2,200 trips out of the 11,000 were happily outfitters okay 80% of the outfitters were running 68% of the trips. That's like 3,100 trips out of 11,000. So 20% of the outfitters are running the majority of the trips (unintelligible). Okay when (unintelligible) happen, in the EA the only thing I want to talk about this is 2015 the river was closed from, where was it closed from? (unintelligible) just the upper it was closed until the 3rd Saturday in May, then they opened it to fishing liberalized the season. In the EZ it says and the outfitters you know expanded their growth in 2016 by 300% or some big number. It was even more than that because they're multiplying by zero, it's like undefined. So it went from zero because nobody was fishing to wow, look at all this growth, everybody's fishing in May, March, and February and January so this is the increase in growth that early time of year from 2016 and it wasn't opened before that. The other think you see is this idea of peak season from June right, July, August, September, October, so June to September that's the peak that you were talking about. And the most trips every done is 3,000 in mid-June, salmon flies. Okay so how do you manage that distribution? That's why we're here. I don't know. (unintelligible) by allocation so at this point in the is what the direction, what direction are we going to go. Are we going to do it by allocation? For allocation is 2017 numbers you could do it by historic use. Whatever you did in 2017 that's what you get going forward. That's what happened on the VH2, that's one way to do it here. Upper lower river closures, do we do that, do we not, do we just do the upper, do we manage portions of the upper, do you do it temporally, days of the week, or do you do it temporally by peak season? I don't know that's what we're talking about but allocation days, how many outfitter days they did previous years, closures, temporal closures, rest and rotation we talked about that a bunch, do you do it that way? Do you manage this use across different reaches? Do you cap SRP numbers, I would propose based on the skate board ramp graph and also the percentages, the percentiles that capping SRP numbers isn't effective at doing anything because as we added more and more outfitters it's not where the rate of increase changed. Rate of increase was not correlated to the number of outfitters. Limit trips per outfitter per day. One thing I don't have on this is distribution on the upper river where they put in, where they launch. Someone said something about man, the number of outfitted boats at Lyons Bridge is really high. The reason for the number of boats at Lyons Bridge being very high is that's the start right? We can't go above that so everybody goes to the top and starts putting from there. Did you know that most of the race cars in the Indi 500 are at the first lap, because then everybody starts crashing. Limit launches per site per reach. So there's different ways to do that. You could limit launches per day which is West Fork Bitterroot, or you could like on the Beaverhead Big Hole they limit it by launches per site. No more than 2 launches or 3 launches at any one FAS depending on where you are. Okay so different ways to do it. Idaho it's 4 launches per reach.

So West Fork 2 launches per day in a certain reach. And we were starting to talk about that. And then peak seasons so you even incorporate a peak season. We talked about it temporally. On the Beaverhead Big Hole their peak season is that's the number of days. They're allotted number of days on the Beaverhead Big Hole they're within June and July and July and August on the Beaverhead. So if you give someone 30 days they can use 30 days in June or July and then the rest is open, the idea of shoulder season. Limit launches to the time of day this was talked about early on where outfitters only launch in the morning or something. And one thing that hasn't been discussed in the April plan was how other than 5 years but how do you evaluate it. The evaluation on the Beaverhead Big Hole goes something like this. How did it go over the last 5 years? It was great. Excellent. It was great. So we'll just continue another 5 years. There was no evaluation on number of launches per site, per reach or any of that. There's no graphs on any review and I think that should be a corporate. But that was it. And so percentiles, historic use, number of launches, that's what I presented. Fish, Wildlife, and Parks numbers presented in a different way. I hope that helps.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: Okay, any questions for Mike? Yeah Mark

Mark Odegard: Statistics from Fish, Wildlife, and Parks show that the number of users on the section from Lyon down to the Lake there are actually more boat users than there are shore users so where are all those boat users coming from.

Michael Bias: So remember this, this is important, this is (unintelligible) point is the numbers I presented were overall for the year, not for any particular launch during any particular time. I went the complete year so in the (unintelligible) survey, 15, to 17 and in the (unintelligible) survey shows between 0 and 100% use by outfitters on that reach that's during June, July, August for that time period. And that's important. Those are real numbers but it's only that time frame, the field survey stuff, field survey data was surveyed people between Lyons and the lake by river technicians that were asking people as they came in or put onto the river (unintelligible) so the field survey information was important for June, July, August and so (unintelligible) they looked at and that's why, it's like oh man my graphs are at 10% use but that is throughout the year for the whole upper, I didn't look at just Lyons Bridge so that's

Mark Odegard: This is the whole section?

Michael Bias: Right so the field survey, the camera survey was right below Lyons Bridge and the (unintelligible) survey numbers from Lyon's to I want to say the Ruby, a McAtee primarily and then down to the lake through the summer. So it's a variation in survey technique. You know one was the mail in survey, I think the 207,000's from the mail in survey but the thing about that graph is the arrow bars, the line going up and the line going down is really tight, it's suggests that it's pretty accurate and those numbers are really pretty tight and those are the only numbers we have other than the (unintelligible).

Mark Odegard: I'm trying to get at the number of non-commercial boat users

Michael Bias: So am I since 2011 (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: sounds like it's quite a few to me

Michael Bias: Yes

Mark Odegard: Maybe that's where a lot of our problems

Michael Bias: Well remember this when you're reading the (unintelligible) survey data this is very (unintelligible) and I already said this I said outfitted use is from 0 to 100% in the camera there. 100% can be just 2 boats, if it's me and Scott launching at Lyons Bridge in October that's 100% outfitter use right but it's only 2 boats.

Mark Odegard: (unintelligible) that ask people what type of fishing they do (unintelligible) from Hebgen to Lyons the highest number of waders was in that section and then from the Dam down to the Jefferson was the second highest number of waders. The number of waders in the Lyon to the Dam were I think it was a high percentage of float wading fishermen (unintelligible) it just it sounds like there's a lot of float fishermen that we don't know about

Michael Bias: That are not commercial

Mark Odegard: yeah

Michael Bias: Thanks for the opportunity (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: Well Mike I thought you were going to tell us about the Michigan rule.

Michael Bias: Well that comes under, so all those variations we talked about at lunch and also when this is, comes under how do you want to manage that distribution right so we can do it I would not capping SRP's because that essentially doesn't do anything and it doesn't allow for opportunity of entry which we should talk about. And so if the, the thing about allocation here's what happens. I told you what happened right because when they instituted allocation on the Beaverhead Big Hole the point was we're going to manage that steep increase in growth and this is how we're going to do it. We're going to give you however many days, well and they cap the number of permits. That instantly put a value on it and I think it was initially it was an artifact, it was oh, man look what happened. And so it's a closed system, you can't get in. There's only a finite amount of them and then they instantly turned into a monetary value and so that's one aspect. There's another aspect that State law says you cannot break up permits so partial days if I have 100 day permit I can't see you 10 of them, which is a challenge but the other thing I have and so with allocation is when the State said we don't want to monetize the permits that pushed them into managing that distribution by launches per day okay I think that's the only option they had. Unless you take in the other consideration, the other models like what they do in Michigan for steel headers is essentially what happens is the State pulls the days and the permittee applies

for those days. So I had an SRP based on historic use say it's 30 days I get (unintelligible) my 30 days if I want to transfer or sell my business I can sell that permit but there's no days tied to it. The new outfitter applies gets the permit and then has to apply for days. The value of the permit is not tied to any number of days under that model. Now the question that I asked earlier is what is that concern of ours. Why should we care? Right, why should we, we just want to manage days, shouldn't matter to anybody other than the permit holder whether his days become valuable in some way or not. And so we looked at that, I looked at that and we had outfitters in a room so Melissa worked hard on her plan and what that does I don't have a draft so it's hard for me to comment. (unintelligible) we look at the percentile graph that I showed you. She took 50 days, 50 days was, I forget the percentage, (unintelligible) 68% of the users, like 150 outfitters would get 50 days or less. They get a 100 day permit right so they get an SRP and they stamp 100 days on it so their good for 100 days either way. And what that does is it takes into account 100 (unintelligible) users and minimizes agency administrative burden so Cheryl's not doing anything other than she already is and the permit holder (unintelligible) has 100 days. And they get however we decide that they're allowed to transfer them, transfer them back and forth. And then the other, anything over 100 days is historic use. So the outfitter that had 1,012 in 2017 has 1,012 days on his permit or her permit (unintelligible) I can tell you the number and the reason for that is the idea is you want to stop that skate board ramp and how do you do that well you got to push down on it so this upper end is capped at their historic use. They can go forward in the time with 1,012 days or whatever it is 1,200 days and they count for what 15, it's 24 outfitters with 181, that will be in this system allocated very historic use. So the beauty of this is in my mind, low administrative burden on Fish, Wildlife, and Parks 150 people do it or however many it is, 100 days is 15,000 days plus whatever the 24 is so the cap is it will never go above that but I can tell you, I can see based on those percentiles, anybody with 100 days are probably going to do something around 100 days or whatever they are. They're at 30 days they'll do 30 days, the guys coming over from Dillon are buying 50 days a year they do 50 days regardless so it's staying pretty flat. The other thing on that is you add more tiers or you take, I call them tiers, it's a stratified allocation is what it is. There's no, we could incorporate more strats, more tiers, maybe we could put 25 (unintelligible) but what you're doing is for 150 of those outfitters you're never going to have the one in however many days in that tier. Ever. For the 24 outfitters above 100 days you're never going to have more than whatever the day I calculate at 7,600 days. So 7,600 plus 15,000 is 20,000 days. But that's where it is so those carry it through time you've got flexibility built in, in the 2 system, say the Beaverhead Big Hole flows out and they need to run the Madison 10 more days, I'm not getting penalized, I'm not going to lose my permit, I'm allowed to use those days up to that amount and so there's (unintelligible) details when you apply for a permit is based on the says you did before and that's 5% (unintelligible) or 3% of gross. And that's the cost of the permit so whatever days you ran under your 100 day permit that's how many days you're going to pay for, for the (unintelligible). So the State's not losing money, BLM's not losing money it's (unintelligible), it's managing that growth commercial users through time at a set limit that you're never going to go above. You cannot, you can

change those days whoever the agency is can change those days. You're not messing with anybody's, one of the big issues with and this is, with managing that use, so there's 2 issues, managing use through launches per day is set at 10, well we got 200 outfitters, 200,000 days and (unintelligible) that's the 2,000% growth well it might not ever get to that but you just allowed that potential to happen. And I had another point on launches per day, the other thing launches per day does not do is ever (unintelligible) skate boarder ramp (unintelligible) put 10 boats here put 10 boats in the next ramp down, 10 boats in the next ramp down. Launches per outfitter per day one of the problems with that, on the Madison River with these Lodges you get a group of, corporate group or something coming in and unbeknownst to the outfitter but they show up on Monday and go oh, we got 24 people will that's 12 boats right? It's some art, I say artificial but some artificial number of 10 boats per day no one knows where that number came from. Well I do, I do it's based on historic launches but say they have 12 boats in one day they can't 2 that, that day they have to send those 2 boats to (unintelligible) or somebody. That's where that messes them up. And then it happens so few times I don't think you're ever going to have any sort of group control, group management of the distribution based on launches per day (unintelligible).

Mike Mitchell: Other questions from Mike

Lauren Wittorp: So under that system you would still be able to sell your SRP's license.

Michael Bias: So here's the deal, Beaverhead, Big Hole guides, Madison River guides never set out to like sell their days. That, when I say it's an artifact (unintelligible) it really is. All of a sudden the Beaverhead Big Hole plan went into effect and they said ah, I need to transfer this, I have 400 days. Initially it started out like \$500 dollars a day, 3 to \$500 dollars that came from the (unintelligible) outfitted days (unintelligible) and that's \$500 dollars a day so that fishing outfitters like I want to sell my permit. \$500 dollars a day because he can't break that permit up so he's the transfer laws are already established and when they implemented VH2 citizens days that automatically pushed them into this great deal for the outfitters, it's a great deal if you're selling one, it's a terrible deal if you're trying to buy one.

Lauren Wittorp: Wouldn't this do the same thing though?

Michael Bias: It depends, it depends on how you allow transfer.

Julie Eaton: In the Beaverhead Big Hole you reduce the number of outfitters because you add a limited SRP so

Michael Bias: Well it's complicated. You can't break up days and under State law when like one person buys someone else's permit those days (unintelligible) you can't break them up so a person that has 300 days and bought 100 day permit now has 400 days. You can't sell it in pieces so he has to sell or she has to sell a 400 day permit and what has happened on the Beaverhead Big Hole they started out at 200 outfitters, how many outfitters do you have now?

So that's 2,000, 1999, 2000, 2001 it went into effect somewhere in there. It started out at 200, this is an accumulating number outfitter days per outfitter. 64 you got 64 outfitters (unintelligible) some of them want more days than their permit than they can ever possibly outfit. 1,000 day permit on the Beaverhead Big Hole. There's just not that many days in a year but it happened because it was an accumulation affect.

Julie Eaton: And that has to do with limiting SRP's (unintelligible) when you limit SRP's then that means you're getting less and less outfitters as things change. If you leave SRP unlimited then the days are finite but they can move among many, many more outfitters (unintelligible) with the SRP. (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: It's like a block, one permit (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Yeah (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: and then you can't see it right because you're, you're like I got 900 days I can see my, (unintelligible)

Melissa Glaser: Is the shoulder season added to that?

Michael Bias: So shoulder seasons is a really good question and I got a perfect example that of unintended consequence and this boy (unintelligible) so shoulder season initially they said okay 200 outfitters and it was only like 4,000 days, 4,000 total user days on the Big Hole for June and July, shoulder seasons so they said okay you know we have these guys running mostly around salmon flies and they instituted the permit to be June and July, took their annual days, how many did they run June and July and that was their number of days and so at that time in 2000, 1999 and 2000, the push was its wicked crowded on salmon fly on the Big Hole how do we manage those days well we're going to limit outfitters to whatever number of days they had last 3 to 5 years and cap those days for those 2 months and then if you have a Beaverhead Big Hole permit outside of those 2 months you could draw on as many days as you want. So (unintelligible) outfitters are like oh, April and May, March (unintelligible) I'll run days there and then what happened the Beaverhead blew up. It was this perceived increase use of shoulder seasons in particular on the Big Hole. And there was some local landowners and people out of Butte and some out of Dillon saying oh, man getting used to these outfitters on the shoulder seasons getting to high we go to manage them. So now they're looking at trying to manage the shoulder seasons on the Big Hole which is why I said angle management not (unintelligible) season.

Lauren Wittorp: Yeah so question for you with that so if you made it an annual cap so if you took like say 2017 numbers, made it shoulder season and the State owned days and there were unlimited SRP's wouldn't that just solve the problem? If you had anyone could get an SRP

Michael Bias: what problem?

Lauren Wittorp: the problem of days being of any value being put, couldn't the State own the days and unlimited SRP's and then there would be no value.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: There would be some value right because I have a Madison permit so I have some value there. We talked about this. If I have a lodge and I'm running 500 boats a year, 500 trips a year and I have a Madison River permit that historically I've been running 500 trips a year every year. I'm selling my launch and the new person buying it is a qualified outfitter, demonstrated use, he can apply for that, they get the permit in the sale and they apply for those days but there is some historic precedent use that total use of those days so

Lauren Wittorp: But what if they were a blank SRP so if anyone could have an SRP and days weren't tied to the SRP the State hold the days and X amount of days.

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Lauren Wittorp: I mean FWP said they could manage the system

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: We'd have to detail that system

Lauren Wittorp: Okay

Michael Bias: In some fashion but (unintelligible) for meeting the objective (unintelligible) and I keep getting back to that because my question earlier was why would you care if someone's permit is (unintelligible)?

Lauren Wittorp: Why would I care if some many days on the river was (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: No if my permit was worth (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: you're tying them together so you're saying that the monetization of the permit somehow and maybe it's opportunity whatever (unintelligible) and maybe that, I don't know. In the tier system or the (unintelligible) anyone under 100 gets (unintelligible) and there's no limit SRP's beyond historic use of days. They'll come in with a 50 day (unintelligible)

Lauren Wittorp: So growth would still occur then?

Michael Bias: No

Jim Slaterry: No

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) on tiers you can still say, you can still have a limit to SRP's or you don't have to we could have a limit on days. All these days are accounted for, applying for your SRP if one of these guys retire (unintelligible) reduces his number those days go into the pool, I don't know we can work on details. The systems are there, they exist, that's what we want to manage.

Don Skaar: The other think I worry about with the monetizing is it would affectively become like liquor licenses you know and those aren't going away. We'll have those 500 years from now. Everything I've seen that they're doing with the brew pubs.

Michael Bias: It's not because the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms people set out to monetize the liquor licenses. It's the (unintelligible) of the permit out there that monetized it.

Don Skaar: I guess the purpose of my bringing that up was just that it's created a system that's so imbedded. I don't know that it'll ever go away and if you decided that, that's no longer the right way to manage use on the river it's going to be hell to change that.

Michael Bias: Well yeah

Don Skaar: So that's what I worry about.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: they landed to stream monetization that VH2 is you can't break that permit. There are no availability of 6 days permit, there (unintelligible) and so if you go get (unintelligible) some parceling out you could transfer 20 days, 25 days or some amount that isn't burdensome (unintelligible). One thing with this conglomeration of permit days (unintelligible) State law says you have to sell it in its entirety. That's the other thing. I have 400 days, I can't sell 50 or 20 or (unintelligible) I have to sell (unintelligible).

LOTS OF BACKGROUND NOISE (SHUFFLING PAPERS AND SUCH) CAN'T HEARU

Charlotte Cleveland: Under, if we're talking about (unintelligible) where does the new person who wants to start up an outfitting business get into this?

Michael Bias: So right off that bat we have 203 SRP's only 175 of them have any use. There's 28 right there with zero use.

Charlotte Cleveland: I'm confused. So let's say there's 50 people who want to come in.

Michael Bias: Right

Charlotte Cleveland: Only 32 would be able to get a permit?

Michael Bias: Right

Charlotte Cleveland: So the idea that management plans need to provide opportunities for river service providers to compete for the business of paying customers, that person who doesn't fit into the first 35 doesn't have an opportunity to compete for the business of paying customers.

Michael Bias: Neither does anybody without a permit.

Charlotte Cleveland: No but this is what, this is under the river service provider statutes where there's supposed to be an opportunity to compete for the business of paying customers and if there's a system that's set up that doesn't allow a new person to come in and compete I'm concerned that it doesn't meet the statute.

Michael Bias: Right so we need

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: That has nothing to do with new people coming in.

Charlotte Cleveland: It does it says

Michael Bias: That's existing people that have a permit, equal opportunity for them for someone to come to me and get a trip.

Charlotte Cleveland: It just says provide opportunities for river service providers to compete for the business of paying customers. So I thought in other words if I come in as an outfitter and I want to compete but I can't get any days that, that plan is not fulfilling this

Michael Bias: Yes it is.

Charlotte Cleveland: How do I compete if I don't, if I

Julie Eaton: Because you're not a river service provider

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: You can't compete because you don't have an SRP

Julie Eaton: Yeah

Michael Bias: You have to get the SRP first.

Charlotte Cleveland: Let's say I do get my SRP, doesn't this management plan suggest that you have to have an ability for that person to compete for the business of a paying customer?

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) right?

Charlotte Cleveland: No if under the current system there are no more days available.

Michael Bias: that's (unintelligible) it's kind of like I'm from Pennsylvania I want to fish the Madison but you won't let me because I can't get a stamp. Sorry you should have put in, in June.

Charlotte Cleveland: So you don't think this statute talks about people coming and actually starting a business

Michael Bias: No we have the mechanism for that to happen. We set it up. It's 5 years down the line and we're at this 24,000 days it's not our fault. We allowed, we set up the mechanism for lotteries for entry, if those have reached capacity what are we going to do? Are we going to add 20 more days or 100 more days just to allow SRP holders to come in? How does that statute work on the West Fork?

Charlotte Cleveland: Don't look at me.

Jim Slattery: Charlotte I think if you get an SRP you get days and that's under this tiered plan then that's all the days that you get.

Charlotte Cleveland: But I don't see it here is my point. Where does that come in?

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: So Charlotte you're saying that every year you would be equal to me.

Charlotte Cleveland: I'm saying that I would have the ability to compete. I certainly wouldn't be equal to you because I'd be just starting out. So I wouldn't have the 25 years that you have on establishing clients and all that kind of stuff but I would still be able to say here I am, here's my website, I'm offering up a service, I'm competing.

Julie Eaton: So that's unlimited growth then.

Charlotte Cleveland: Well or under, that's what I'm asking about how this works in this particular scenario. So I'm just asking the same kinds of questions that would come up for me to look at this

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: have 28 permits open right now and we have a lottery and (unintelligible). There are other barriers to entry. You have to be an outfitter (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: I understand that.

Lauren Wittorp: How would she even get an SRP under those once there gone? How would she be able to get one if you can sell them why would anyone ever give one back for a lottery? Why wouldn't they sell it? So there's no way then for her to ever get one. I think that's what you're trying to say.

Charlotte Cleveland: That's my point.

Michael Bias: I have to pay for mine now. They don't just hand them to you. You still have to like buy it.

Lauren Wittorp: Well right but she can't buy and SRP under this right? So you're saying that after those 20 whatever are gone there would be a lottery system when someone, it says after it's not used for 2 years.

Michael Bias: It's not the systems fault. We set it at 24,000 days. If we're at 24,000 days what do you do? If you're at 100,000 non-residents

Lauren Wittorp: But if there are unlimited SRP's she could compete for those days.

Charlotte Cleveland: I could compete for those days.

Lauren Wittorp: But she could never get an SRP is what I think she's trying to say.

Charlotte Cleveland: Under this I just don't understand how I would fit into this system.

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible) and pay \$4,000 to get in as an outfitter.

Charlotte Cleveland: But then how do I get

Julie Eaton: and get your SRP and then hope

Charlotte Cleveland: and then hope

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: I think it would be left up to Fish, Wildlife, and Parks if they are able to add SRP's (unintelligible) permit to new SRP's

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Lauren Wittorp: so the odds of FWP opening more days that's not going to happen when they think we're already at our limit.

Michael Bias: They might, even if they don't get a single boat out there in the last lottery days, over the last 10 years those have been maxed. You can't do it so you put your name in, you hope you get drawn and if you do great and if you don't oh, I got to go next year or

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Lauren Wittorp: You'd have to be able to buy them off somebody else.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Lauren Wittorp: So why would we want that system to happen again on the Madison if you guys aren't happy with how it works there why would you want

Julie Eaton: Because there's no perfect system but we can tweak that.

Michael Bias: In the elk permit tag world if they want to hunt sheep the statute says I have to have the opportunity to put in to hunt sheep, it doesn't say I have to have a tag, I mean I have to get a tag. I applied for a tag oh I didn't get a sheep tag, I really want to hunt sheep well we're giving you opportunity (unintelligible)

Lauren Wittorp: Isn't that the system that Charlotte was proposing then where she was saying you could apply to get a non-resident stamp so then it was more that system. And I thought that's what you were trying to get at okay.

Tim Aldrich: I got a question that takes us back in a different direction. I look at (unintelligible) in terms of the 5 and 10 day

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Tim Aldrich: you know when (unintelligible) one reach or something like that would be one thing but there's specifically on the Madison that 10 day period, 10 trips per day (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Tim Aldrich: that period and that reach are the ones that use is highest so I guess that's why I think it was seen as an opportunity to maybe corral some of the crowding, reduce some of the crowding for that so it wasn't quite like you said

Michael Bias: I understood that so there's launches out there per day one way (unintelligible) Idaho is launching per outfitter on any one reach. The Beaverhead has it to so I can't put more than 2 boats into one section, 3 boats into and one section.

Tim Aldrich: If you took one reach at a time (unintelligible) reducing I guess social conflict potential like people think by doing that (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: yeah so you're just taking people's business and reducing them to whatever your, yeah (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: Or you have outfitter number 2

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Tim Aldrich: the other side of that you know in what I proposed is well if you think your use is less than 5 or 10 days during that period of time then you're authorization maximum

(unintelligible) as opposed to 5 or 10. So you look at that flat line (unintelligible) outfitters (unintelligible) 150 people in the boat, yeah they pay, they're maxed out (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: So certain times of the year you're telling that lodge owner you know I know that this 1 day you wanted to take (unintelligible) putting more than that out so you're just taking business (unintelligible)

Tim Aldrich: At the same time I'm telling (unintelligible) and need to provide to the fish people that think they (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Julie's been pretty patient.

Jim Slattery: We heard like 2 plans here, I don't know if it's up to us to come up with a plan but maybe we can make, we can say cause what we agree on, commercial use needs to be capped and then we can have like suggest, maybe, we can make suggestions and let FWP figure it out. And like I said we can have like a tier plan, we can have the Michigan plan, is there any other kind of plan out there that might be up for consideration? You guys would want to consider, I mean the outfitters?

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible) consensus because you know some people might say you know (unintelligible) so you don't really get, we're not really figuring out how we can work together to get a good plan.

Melissa Glaser: I think the whole point of this was to come up with rules (unintelligible) related to commercial use (unintelligible) in the draft last year were not good.

Jim Slattery: Well maybe we could suggest a Committee separate from us made up of stakeholders and outfitters, cause this is really an, where I'm going with this is this is really an outfitters problem. How they want to parcel this out, it's really not everyone's here problem. I think we're all in agreement here that we think that outfitters should be capped. I think everyone here has expressed that and then we can come to an agreement with that and then perhaps we can say maybe we, you should, the Committee recommends that you look into these different avenues and whatever else that might work. Because I think we're going to get dragged down here forever trying to figure out what someone else's business needs to be done. I don't think that's our charter. I understand what you're saying but I don't think it's our charter to do that.

Julie Eaton: Jim real quick there's some of the magic issue there, I'm not say that you know when you look at the chart and how many guided trips there are, I'm not saying that you're making the whole system go to hell, I'm just saying that I'm willing to step up and be an example of you know, I can take a haircut, that's (unintelligible) okay how can we all work together to make this work.

Jim Slattery: Well I think a haircuts coming for everybody.

Julie Eaton: Right but I'm

Jim Slattery: How much hair are they going to take off?

Julie Eaton: Right

Jim Slattery: Nobody wants to get scalped.

Julie Eaton: right and I'm (unintelligible) but let's not, we're focusing on that one little red (unintelligible) let's get the whole picture back.

Mike Mitchell: So on some of these really chewy things I think it's fine to break them out in bite sized chunks so we aren't trying to swallow the elephant whole. But Julie's right that we also have to keep them in context of the other aspects of the rule that the Committees, or versions of the rule the Committee is considering. One thing to your point Jim about if there is some uncertainty within the Committee about the best way to approach caps to include no caps all the way (unintelligible) possibilities. The people ultimately that are going to be making the decision based on this are the Commission and so if you can put these different forms of caps in an alternative and just acknowledge the uncertainty, we're not going to make that call. The decision makers, here are the possibilities we considered here's how they play out. And if the Committee does not want to say this is the cap issue, we want to identify them let's put them in there in different alternatives so that the decision makers can see how or if these different approaches might affect the decision. Does that sound reasonable? So it's perfectly fine to say the Committee is not comfortable deciding on one thing. So let's capture the diversity of possibilities that are up there and say well more work needs to be done to distinguish these or decision makers it's on you. Does that make sense? So when we're talking about adding to any of these alternatives different approaches to capping are there some, so you started to enumerate 2 possibilities

Jim Slattery: that I've heard

Mike Mitchell: yeah that you've heard are there other approaches that we want to consider?

Lauren Wittorp: I think without recognizing what Charlotte's and Don's ideas end up capping commercial use but not directly capping commercial use.

Mike Mitchell: Okay, so that would be a different capping alternative that we could look at.

Charlotte Cleveland: Yes, because we are capping but we're just not capping commercial use.

Jim Slattery: We're capping all use.

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Jim Slattery: So that would be another one.

Mike Mitchell: Are there others? Mark

Mark Odegard: The survey said there are too many boats on the river. The survey didn't say there are too many commercial boats on the river.

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Mark Odegard: So how many other boats are there and nobody can tell me. You could probably find out how many boats are registered in Madison, Gallatin and the counties around here see how many local ones

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: I have to register mine so

Julie Eaton: Your trailer, you have to register your trailer but we don't have to register if it's a drift boat or not unless you put a motor on it (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: I think Don and my plan was directly addressing crowding that was causing the social conflict. Because we weren't centering proposals on the commercial (unintelligible) because it's not commercial, clearly it's not. It's a variety of non-resident, resident, it's everybody so that's very different I think then trying to figure out how many boats there are because it's everybody.

Jim Slattery: It is a vehicle though.

Charlotte Cleveland: Yeah

Jim Slattery: to accomplish it.

Mike Mitchell: Okay you can imagine an alternative where what you and Don have captured as part of that alternative then we can run it through the same process.

Charlotte Cleveland: Oh yeah

Don Skaar: A perfect example of that is alternative 8 where you're capping both non-commercial days and commercial days, you're capping commercial days you got to have mechanism for how you're parcel that out so we're obviously dealing with both.

Mike Mitchell: Well that was going to be my next question for some of these ideas are they already captured in any of the alternatives or do we need to construct new alternatives (unintelligible).

Julie Eaton: I think they're completely thought out and generally there. You have parts and pieces which is that's what kind of came out in the numbers but is there any, (unintelligible).

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Tim Aldrich: We need to be painfully clear I guess about what a regulated thing does you got to not (unintelligible). That's what we've been talking about here. I look at the proposed rule from April a year ago and rule 3 was designed to do something and couldn't do it and with each one of those proposed rules there the reason for a new rule 3. (unintelligible) stop it where it is. (unintelligible) so where over we go with allocation or whatever it might be let's make sure that we look at what does this really (unintelligible) there's a sense of reality here that's got to be front and center.

Julie Eaton: Exactly

Tim Aldrich: I know I'll be looking at it again someday.

Mike Mitchell: So where I (unintelligible) to look at different forms (unintelligible) some of which are already included in our alternatives. Maybe fleshing them out in a little bit more detail is that where we are? Waiting So that was the next sort of, I won't say contentious but cheery, cheery issue about how to solve that problem and for those of you that are thinking about it what kind of ideas have bubbled to the surface?

Jim Slattery: Well I've heard, having days you know for wade only or having days of allowing, a couple days of allowing boats, I don't know how you want to parcel that out. I don't know I'm kind of hitting a road block for me. (unintelligible) moving more input.

Julie Eaton: In that upper wade section there are a couple of areas that are hard to get to so it would actually be (unintelligible) a little bit just do the access. So I think it was wade only and we agree there's a few areas in that was it (unintelligible) section that aren't that easy to get to.

Don Skaar: Yes

Julie Eaton: On other rivers you have that same issue and we've gone for easements or you know some sort of where your high water mark is a potable could we do an easement that gives us an upper path or no or I mean there's lots of ways to

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Julie Eaton: If we got to a point (unintelligible) gosh darn it let's make sure that we are really providing all of that and not having islands of (unintelligible) what we like to say is privatized or if we can't get easements have a couple days where you just load them up and fish in the boat and float on through. Those are a couple of things that Don you have experience.

Don Skaar: Yeah over lunch, I'm not sure exactly where that spot was we were talking about developing some walk in access on that state section

Michael Bias: State section

Don Skaar: Downstream from Three Dollar Bridge so that would be one way of making that a more yes viable wade section if we did something like that and that's nothing we're going to do tomorrow that's for sure.

Julie Eaton: That's a great idea

Michael Bias: That would come into play on if we 4.6 is a long reach if we break it out to some sort of Saturday, Sunday walk wade from Raynolds to Three Dollar Bridge section. That allows for making that area smaller. We can go from Pine Butte, use Pine Butte as the new Lyons Bridge or Pine Butte to Lyons as open float fishing and everything above Pine Butte is some sort of walk wade.

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Julie Eaton: For a resident in there absolutely

Michael Bias: The easement thing comes off the Blackfoot Corridor, (unintelligible) recently like this year and they finally finished it and it was where Blackfoot Coalition got together and go the land owners to agree to a 15 foot easement on either side of the Blackfoot to allow walk wade access.

Julie Eaton: Those are long term goals for 4 year worthy.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Michael Bias: If we define now whatever this Three Dollar Bridge walk in section is identify it and from there we can work the various reaches and different management options and then move forward.

Jim Slattery: I think Pine Butte down to Lyons is probably the most accessible wade-able section of the river.

Michael Bias: I think there's a lot of great sections on the entire river that are accessible to wade only.

Jim Slattery: Yeah I would agree.

Michael Bias: And so we don't have to, that's another

Jim Slattery: So I guess what I'm getting at is the people that are challenged that can't walk down Three Dollar Bridge to the Big Bend or whatever that's where those people are

going. That's where those wade fisher are going they didn't want to throw boats in there I think they're going to, I think we're not solving any problems with that.

Michael Bias: No if there was a launch imagine the

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: If there was a launch at Three Dollar Bridge

Jim Slattery: That would be the perfect launch, Three Dollar Bridge to Pine Butte you know it's a mile long keep going back and forth all day I don't know. So I you know, I don't know where we are with that.

Michael Bias: Well we have the head of access right here. What happened with the Three Dollar Bridge boat access?

Don Skaar: What happened with it?

Michael Bias: Yeah I guess it was there and now it's not. Why is, how many boats are launching at Raynolds Pass how well used is that launch?

Don Skaar: I don't know.

Jim Slattery: Does anyone else have any thoughts on that?

Lauren Wittorp: I know yesterday we discussed alternate half the time allowing status quo half the time making it walk and wade only a part of alternative 5 (unintelligible) so it rotated even and odd days and on the lower section it was all even days.

Julie Eaton: I think for a commercial we can understand that but that's asking for all kinds of bad (unintelligible) it's very confusing to people. It sounds (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: It's pretty unmanageable.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: You mean the specific day thing?

Julie Eaton: Yes the switching

Jim Slattery: I think, if we did something like that I think the upper section would be the one that you would need to alternate. I think the lower section just the way it is, just let people take their boats down there.

Michael Bias: So let's (unintelligible) is the channels status quo, leave the channels alone

Jim Slattery: I feel that

Michael Bias: that we're discussing now (unintelligible) Lyons the place

Lauren Wittorp: Are you asking me specifically

Michael Bias: No I'm asking (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: The lower section should be open for vessel that's what I think.

Michael Bias: Well I didn't propose that you proposed that so

Lauren Wittorp: Actually FWP proposed it.

Michael Bias: Oh, you keep passing the buck around.

Lauren Wittorp: I mean that's where it came from they were the ones who originally, last April. They were the ones that proposed that. I think the status quo could remain there if the upper section were walk in wade only all the time I just believe that wade fishermen should have a place

Michael Bias: well let's go status quo on the channels and we'll discuss, negotiate some walk wade in the upper

Charlotte Cleveland: What's the channels

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Lauren Wittorp: I think it's not separate to me. That it would have to be

Michael Bias: Oh, that's unfortunate because I was going to say

Lauren Wittorp: I think that all it could

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Lauren Wittorp: I thought that what we proposed yesterday was a way to compromise.

Michael Bias: Well you proposed every other day I said Saturday or Sunday.

Lauren Wittorp: Well I wanted it to be equal amounts of time not just one day a week. I don't think Montanans and wade anglers are asking too much to have equal

Michael Bias: And you can walk wade on the entire 39 (unintelligible) wherever you want to walk wade.

Lauren Wittorp: Yeah I completely understand that I just you could have boats there and people are asking for a place to fish without boats.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Lauren Wittorp: We have the option it's critical here. People have been asking (unintelligible) how it's been since the 50's

Michael Bias: It could have you know what I'm saying, let's leave the channels alone

Jim Slattery: Yes

Michael Bias: and discuss that and your saying no you're wanting to do them as boats and I'm saying no

Lauren Wittorp: No I'm saying the lower we could leave as status quo if the upper were walk and wade only.

Michael Bias: No we can leave the lower alone and discuss the upper.

Julie Eaton: They're different animals

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Lauren Wittorp: I'm not sure how that's compromise.

Mark Odegard: lower is there water all year to float that?

Melissa Glaser: It depends on the river but yeah, it kind of consolidates usually but

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mark Odegard: On the satellite images it shows a diversion

Julie Eaton: Yeah it depends on what the swing is

Michael Bias: And it's a challenge (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: So is the status quo, excuse me, satisfactory for the channels and the real issue is the real probably that we're trying to address up river from that?

Lauren Wittorp: so for me no I think it's a combination Mike if you made the lower status quo to get the upper to be walk wade or make sure that to me it's a combination of making sure there's that

Michael Bias: I can tell you right now the status quo is what it is and the April plan was rejected so right now we can anyone in a boat, not even commercial can use boat areas float access both areas and so the boat guys are now saying let's leave the bottom alone and we'll give up a portion to the upper and you're still not wanting to discuss that and so the boat guys can go

forget it we won't talk about any of it we'll just leave it the way it is and still get to use the whole thing.

Tim Aldrich: No (unintelligible) allowed in boat access

Michael Bias: Right we'll just leave it the way it is and there is no walk wade section anywhere.

Don Skaar: I understand the value of having the walk wade sections book ends because then you have an uninterrupted portion in between to float, uninhibited float angling but we did have another idea that was Marks idea for I guess we shouldn't forget about that. Rotating wade sections

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mark Odegard: We discussed you don't want to break up the float.

Julie Eaton: So yeah

Mark Odegard: So you'd move it up to the bottom of the current (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: You take 4 miles and put it on the bottom and float 6 miles and you have a 16, 17 mile walk wade section (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: How about if we give you 9 and ½ months and then we take the wade fishermen and we get 2 and ½ months

Michael Bias: How about walk wade on the entire river where ever you want. Right now.

Jim Slattery: It's not the same.

Julie Eaton: It's not the same for us either we got more walk wade which you know I'm not but you know.

Mark Odegard: The conflict probably isn't coming a lot from the commercial users

Jim Slattery: Yeah the conflicts not from the commercial users at all

Scott Vollmer: I don't want to sound like it's me or you

Jim Slattery: Well I misspoke I'm the advocate because the people that I represent on this issue for the wade fishermen because that's again as I said before I get every day at my place I hear about it. So and those are the people that are using the wade sections. So it is a real

legitimate concern for a lot of people that come through my door. So that's kind of why I'm advocating for that. I know we're not supposed to be advocating but.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: So that's what the people that use the upper river that's what I hear.

Scott Vollmer: So let's do a hypothetical, the hypothetical being the only way to access is via wade what's Three Dollar Bridge going to look like in that hypothetical scenario. We've been talking about crowding, crowding, crowding how's that going to help it?

Jim Slattery: It's going to remain

Scott Vollmer: Because we know how difficult it is to walk around in there

Jim Slattery: I would say on average during the entire season let's say that there's 20 cars a day down there. It's not going to have any affect.

Michael Bias: They're not launching boats.

Jim Slattery: Right they're not launching boats but they're complaining about the boats. That's the difference and this is about social conflict, alright? That's why we're here.

Don Skaar: What about the boats and the crowding per se right?

Jim Slattery: Well the crowding's kind of an issue to but then it's exacerbated by putting boats floating past you too while you're working a fish and the outfitters are the ones that are respectful on that and that's not the issue it's the other people that don't have the etiquette.

Michael Bias: And you know we (unintelligible) Saturday and Sunday about Pine Butte and you don't want that you want the whole thing from July to (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: Well it's conversely the same thing

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: why don't you just take Mondays and Tuesdays and then you

Michael Bias: I don't care which day you pick

Jim Slattery: No you pick then you can float down there

Michael Bias: I pick Saturday and Sunday

Charlotte Cleveland: How about we just

Jim Slattery: Well that would work up there if you want to have float access only on Saturday and Sunday that works.

Julie Eaton: That's what Jim said. How about we just put commercial in there we only let non-commercial educated people in there and it won't be me because

Jim Slattery: No you can't do that. I'm just saying who the problem really is.

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible) to the problem really is

Jim Slattery: Well on the flip side if we want to get (unintelligible) most of the guides aren't going to be through there on the parts that I said we should separate it out or you know no float access between June 18th to October 1st. Most of that's not guides they're fishing the main river.

Melissa Glaser: If it's really an etiquette thing with the boats then we can (unintelligible) the education program and then in a year from now or 2 years from now during evaluation we can see how that changes, the satisfaction with the waders up there. If we keep it status quo but you're allowed to access for wade fishing.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Lauren Wittorp: (unintelligible) it's not an etiquette thing they truly want somewhere to fish were there aren't boats.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: It just goes to why can't we all just get along. Everybody wants their own little section on the river but you can't have (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: and for the most part everybody's happy on the river but people that are complaining are the ones that maybe answering the surveys because they want to say something.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: Are any other rivers (unintelligible) any walk wade is at the most 1 day. Beaverhead it's 1 day, Big Hole 1 day, West Fork it's 1 day. And Saturday Sunday 2 days for 9 miles I'm kind of surprised you're not just like jumping on that. When at this time we can throw the whole thing whenever we want. Put it at Reynolds, that's a challenge, it's not an easy section to row so you might actually get some western style free boarding down through there.

Mark Odegard: I'm just commenting from Ennis Bridge down to the, maybe a little past Valley Garden to me it's crowded with waders.

Michael Bias: That's why they're trying to (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: Well not only that's where there's a lot more public land. That's the nature of the beast

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: again I (unintelligible) exactly what I was saying before

Mark Odegard: I moved down there because I thought there were too many boats on the other sections. That's why I fish there but there's a lot of people there too. There's a lot of people who don't know how to fish.

Julie Eaton: I have question on the upper, this is just, what do you think of this one thing not all the ramifications that are on it but fishing from a boat again I know you want to get rid of them but let's just fishing from a boat on that upper section that moves people through does that not attractive at some days at some times as opposed to you've got to access by boat and get out and fish. I mean I don't really care but in my mind that moves you through and gets the boats through. Is that of any interest? (unintelligible) Is that unfair?

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: Don't want to talk about it (unintelligible)? In my mind it's a helpful thing. (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: Have you ever worked a fish and then a boat comes down and the fish is down?

Julie Eaton: Are you really asking me that question?

Jim Slattery: Well

Julie Eaton: Have you ever worked a river that's, yeah of course. I mean I want to live in a world that I get mine that I'm not asking 100% for mine. Yeah let's carve out some (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: So you're just suggesting that just took away the wade walk designation

Julie Eaton: No, I'm just saying as an option again it has no other components to it but if we would put a boat at a certain time different than the way we do it now in that area about Lyons is it helpful to allow that boat to move through by fishing from the boat and keep on going or does it create more congestion stopping and staying, I don't know. In my mind it pushes it through. I just didn't know if that was a helpful thing or not and I'm not saying that boats there every day, there's all different things you can do with that.

Tim Aldrich: So you're float fishing allowed is what you're saying there and then go on through.

Julie Eaton: Yes

Tim Aldrich: And right now we're really wrestling over something that says you can't float in park and get out

Julie Eaton: No I mean we still have, I'm just say, you know there's, are we really at either or at this point?

Tim Aldrich: No I'm just trying, I'm still thinking about (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Tim Aldrich: Having people floating through fishing as they go or have people float in

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Tim Aldrich: or not have any of it, not have any floating.

Julie Eaton: no there's no or, there's we can add anything we want to that. We can say on these days it's wade only in whatever section on these other days we allow boats, do we allow boats on whatever those days are that you know we're giving a pass to go in there to float through does that help the day that you gift the boat people access to that.

Tim Aldrich: A temporal separation based on time. (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: but if a boat is there

Tim Aldrich: It's not allowed at this time but is allowed at this time

Julie Eaton: Whatever you want, my question is (unintelligible) if some how you allow a boat there whatever time I don't care is it a different thing to allow to fish from a boat than to stop it. Does that help in any way, shape or form if the boat is there?

Tim Aldrich: I'd have to ask (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: That's what I'm

Mark Odegard: I haven't (unintelligible) from people (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: So you're saying no difference

Mark Odegard: Not really but there just aren't that many

Julie Eaton: I'm thinking of areas like there's (unintelligible) where you a whole and you stay there all day.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: yeah just couldn't do it. Alright no help, no help.

Mike Mitchell: I'll give you a shout out, I think a lot of was that's what the conversation needs to be doing okay is we have these particularly thorny issues and need to be talking creatively about solutions and so realizing that without coming up with a creative solution then not only are we not going to get to consensus we're not going to solve any problems. It goes back to the status quo. If you like the status quo that's fine, if you don't that's what we're going to be stuck with so thanks I really appreciate what you're trying to do and I encourage everybody to take a similar approach that you need to be creative. It's not going, I think the (unintelligible) being win, win, win, win, win, across all the stakeholders are just slim to none so it may be well can we minimize the damage. Or can we make people as happy as we can so that these, well I think people have said all along it's sharing pain, I'm willing to give a little bit if I feel like other people are giving. So I would definitely going forward encourage you to think that way. What's the creative solution? It's not necessarily to turn everything great but it might take the red a little bit more towards the orange.

Julie Eaton: I'm going to say it but with what you just said I feel like we're starting with all this management of commercial and we're like yeah will give, and I just don't hear any okay well then we'll do, I'm just not hearing it and maybe I have deaf ears but I just see April rule plus more rules and I just don't (unintelligible)

Lauren Wittorp: I mean I would say when we talked yesterday I was part of (unintelligible) Don and I down to is the April rule (unintelligible) rest and rotation and launch site (unintelligible) which then Mike as you said you're like well you limiting where we can go ever on this float section. You were like great and now it's wide trying to find those areas you're not limiting those areas why can't there be a walk wade section and that's why we were trying to think of a way to help that.

Julie Eaton: I understand it's a lot of impact just the last few years of wade all over and that's okay so don't think that just waders are being impacted by the flip side and I'm not asking you not to do anything I'm not. I'm just saying there is some (unintelligible) already.

Charlotte Cleveland: I think everybody suffers from the congestion and the conflict is a result of it.

Don Skaar: Julie are you saying you think we're hampered by the April rule in our deliberations here?

Julie Eaton: I really do, I've never wanted to start there because it, yeah I mean for me it's like really restrictive and then we're starting there you know I just feel like yeah I'm giving I don't know I'm constantly trying to pull a little bit back from that.

Scott Vollmer: It's, exhibit A is right up there too as well.

Michael Bias: My starting point is throwing that thing out

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: kind of what we've been doing has (unintelligible) so (unintelligible) how we going to do that, establishing walk wade how we going to do that. (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: But we kind of got anchored, in my mind we're just anchored in that

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: So you're suggesting we've got 3 or 4 issues we just come up with alternatives and build an alternative that way

Michael Bias: I think we are

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: and we've been doing that.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: flip flopping right we go from non-residence to walk wade and back again to something else but something less (unintelligible) should we do that should we not do that. I think if we go to some of these, I don't know I'm not a facilitator but for example if maybe we should get a whim here and are we going to (unintelligible) if we don't agree on no we're not going to do that I don't know maybe we can check something off and then move on to the next one.

Julie Eaton: That's what I wanted to do with glass. I wanted a win. You know what I mean? I just really wanted us to

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: Go home feeling good

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) SRP's and then we'll have 2 wins and then we'll move onto some of this sticky stuff.

Mike Mitchell: So you're talking about getting the low hanging fruit first.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Michael Bias: I think we covered pretty much everything right? I think everything is out there now there's nothing hidden, we didn't miss anything.

Charlotte Cleveland: Actually I still didn't get a question on alternative 4 about whether this monetized the days or not so that still is a question in my mind so I did need to know that.

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible) because I think by virtue of what's happening with allocation system it is monetized.

Charlotte Cleveland: Okay so it's

Melissa Glaser: Yes

Charlotte Cleveland: the answers yes

Melissa Glaser: that's what I understood right?

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: has to be transparent there's no way around that

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: The only thing that might help it is that is an allocation (unintelligible) current year so you wouldn't have a shoulder season so (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: Some of the getting to the weeds who holds the days and (unintelligible) some of this stuff we're not going to be able to change (unintelligible) State law (unintelligible) I think. (unintelligible)

Charlotte Cleveland: So then let's not opt (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: Well I would like to talk about one other thing a little more from the April rule and that's the rest rotation stuff. And in our discussion yesterday Julie I heard you say well that would, one issue in your mind was it would concentrate people more in the non-rested sections. Is that really true? Maybe what's it's

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: It's very true

Don Skaar: So no I mean you got X number of people showing up on the river this day they're either going to go here or there, why, maybe the waders will all go to the wade section that day and all the floaters will go to the float section. The commercial non-commercial division however we want to do the rest rotation.

Julie Eaton: And also on the Big Hole when you have those days it can be concentrated in that section too. (unintelligible) oh, it's open, none of these.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: So as proposed in the April rule and Lauren this pertains to

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: so you want to close that upper and lower to boats but at the same time you incorporate that into your rest and rotation so for example Quake Lake to Conner's Bridge is whatever day, the first day of the rotation it's closed to boats and establishes a walk wade and that's the first section that's part of the rest and rotation. So effectively rest and rotation goes from Lyon's Bridge to Ennis Bridge and then this happens.

Scott Vollmer: And I'll explain this, I just need a comment from me that some people didn't quite explain what this is. I put this together we all think and learn differently and this is a visual cue for me. This is more a visual thing. I do too. So this is the April plan right here okay? We're you see FF that means that was shut down to access for boats. You know sections according to the April plan. When you see O that's the rest and rotation schedule. Those are the sections that are shut down to commercial use during those days of the week, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. So when you look at Monday let's start there. The bottom chart I'll get to here in a second, from Quake to Raynolds, Raynolds to Lyons, both of them shut down to float fishing. There's an assumption I made there that due to the fact that those are shut down to access from boats there's not going to be much commercial use. Yes there can be but there won't be. At least that's what the numbers has shown us over the years. So take those away from commercial use and besides anyways the bottom chart I was just talking about floats anyways. You put your boat on and doing a float trip. So let's shut down on Monday for commercial outfitting with rest and rotation is Palisades to Mac. The bottom section of the river that's the 2 FF's Ennis to the lake also shut down to access from boats same scenario. As a commercial user we cannot put our boats on that water to operate that day. So every float on Monday that is going to happen for the entire year under that plan those 4 access sites where those floats originate because of the length of floats that we do in a viable commercial float for a full day which most of them are. Go to the bottom you'll see viable commercial floats. On Monday this is the scary part Mac, Storey, Varney, and Warm Springs those are the 4 places that every commercial outfitter puts on, on that day. How does that reduce crowding? It compacts use. It doesn't distribute use or spread out use. And the same applies on Tuesday. It gets a little better on some other days. You can see that going forward Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday and according to the April plan this and this I'll adventure into opinion right here Monday and Tuesday turn that river into a mess much more so than any mess that exists right now. And any day of the year including salmon flies. Because you have every single commercial outfitter who's doing a float trip that day putting on 4 accesses and then I would

argue that the majority in a really really busy season when there are a lot of people here (unintelligible) to Grey Cliff hoot owl restrictions and we're probably not using them then either. Because they some of our guests don't want to get up that early to be off the water by 2 and B a lot of us are like you know it's probably not good for the fish even to fish in the mornings so we're not going to do it. So really it compacts it in honest especially into every commercial operator is putting on, on Monday on Mac, Storey, Varney and on Tuesday, Lyons, Windy, and Varney.

Mark Odegard: It looks like Tuesday is the worst

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: And you know the other thing with it too is they could be some arguments here and I was kind of actually fairly liberal with this because for me personally Mac to Varney isn't a whole day float. I got to go further. I go to 8 Mile. I was kind of making some liberties there to kill a little way in the rest and rotation plan.

Don Skaar: Okay

Scott Vollmer: And especially I mean last year was a perfect example. Mac to Varney, 3 hours at salmon fly time, I'd fly through that thing. I mean I was, I don't back row much, just enough to keep the boat where it needs to be.

Don Skaar: Okay

Scott Vollmer: And I fish slow compared to some other outfitters. Trust me I fish with the here so for me at that time of the year it was Mac to (unintelligible) or actually I should say Storey to (unintelligible) which is about the same as Mac to 8 Mile or Mac to (unintelligible).

Don Skaar: Okay that's good

Scott Vollmer: Did that explain it Mark?

Mark Odegard: Yep

Melissa Glaser: And this doesn't even take into effect run off

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: where do you go on (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: Yeah that's why I said put that in and actually they're full day floats on normal flows. And again even normal flows Mac to Varney is too short for me.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mark Odegard: one of the things that Julie explained to me about the length of the float which us waders don't know about.

Julie Eaton: You can go in at Lyons, what you would do to make that a full day you could lap it. You could do it twice that's going to, some people do that but that's not, that's expensive or you can anchor up. May favorite thing. Anchor up (unintelligible) fish every rock, move a little bit, anchor, you know it changes the dynamic. Later in the year where we get this algae gross green light green slime that's really been covered the last few years I'm going to be forced to go down there on some days. That's not good for anything so those are just some

Scott Vollmer: I know there's (unintelligible) here that get tired of hearing it said but it just needs to be said enough times is the biggest thing in any river recreation plan in my opinion is if you're trying to attack (unintelligible) is the absolute best thing, there's 2 best things in my mind because you've heard me talk about education. And another really good thing is allow the users as best you possibly can to organically spread out as much as possible. That's crucial to think about. I think some of these ideas and alternatives do the exact opposite. We put them in a smaller box.

Don Skaar: Okay well point well taken but you don't want me to ask the question this way but does this mean Thursday and Saturday would be okay?

Scott Vollmer: Well their better. But

Don Skaar: The best of the days.

Scott Vollmer: Thursday and yeah the best of the days

Melissa Glaser: So you're combining the no float day section (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: so there's that advantage. Kill 2 birds with 1 stone kind of.

Melissa Glaser: The thing (unintelligible) the walk wade if you would say put a section on the walk wade that can also be a resident day (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: then you'll force people, yeah that, this commercially but then you add that unknown component of the other boats from there doing their thing that's going to we're confined but again there's nothing (unintelligible). The other boats there (unintelligible) if you're taking them out then they'll be in that section on the best days which that's fine.

Michael Bias: The basics on the Madison, Lyon's to Ennis float and also what 75% of the outfitted trips and you're taking that 75% of outfitted trips and trying to jam 2/3 of them (unintelligible) or all of that 75% (unintelligible) so how does that (unintelligible) is it doubles you on the section where we're all not allowed to float but works great on (unintelligible). But

the other thing is when you think about it like that right so you got dudes coming out of Bozeman or Missoula or wherever they're coming from and they see wow commercial guys aren't allowed to float Lyon's to whatever and Lyon's to (unintelligible) that's where I'm going to go so you got 207,000 users going to Lyon's Bridge. Now does that reduce crowding in that section? The example from this comes out in the Beaverhead Big Hole (unintelligible) rotated days look at that. It's oh, I thought this was a closed section, East Bank on a closed day.

Scott Vollmer: I was talking to Tim about this at lunch is citizen's days on Saturday and Sunday on the Big Hole, (unintelligible) to Divide on Saturday, Divide to Melrose on Sunday. (unintelligible) there's no alleviation of crowding that takes place.

Michael Bias: The concept is great. The concept of coming from (unintelligible) where they rest and rotate section on (unintelligible) system (unintelligible) a challenge. Especially when the issue starting out is crowding. We're going to take 100% of use and jam it into 66% of the (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: I agree with Scott organic distribution is what you called, I call it natural distribution but

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Scott Vollmer: April 19th last year I wanted to go up to Helena but I had to work that day so this is what I worked on while I worked. I did this originally based on the plan and then I played around with different examples of it and I started obviously with 5 days example because of trying to fit in, the biggest things the middle of the river, basically kind of Ruby to Mac is putting in there. But I played around with different versions and they all, every single one came to the point there's a 5 day rest, or I'm sorry, a 7 day rest and rotation schedule you're going to have at minimum of 2 days that it's super compacted use. And my only conclusion came is, well my conclusion was is it shouldn't be any rest and rotation schedule. That is where I stand right now. Now could you make it a little better than this like you were saying Don, suggesting that with the Thursday and Saturday if we scale it back a little bit, yes but that still goes against 1 of my major tenants that Mark just said about allowing organic distribution, organically distribute the use.

Michael Bias: If you look at what happened on the West Fork. Last year they implemented their plan and they had 4 sections that were rotated and what did they find? They had to change it from floats to launches because low and behold everybody was putting in at the top of section 1 and taking out at the bottom of section 1 which was right there because there was no flexibility to go through there when the bottom section was closed you couldn't float into it. And so back to my race track analogy you have all the boats starting at Lyon's and ending at Windy for that (unintelligible) so if you took (unintelligible) and jammed them all in that section and didn't do anything (unintelligible) floats to launches to allow that dispersion to occur below the rest rotate section (unintelligible)

Tim Aldrich: You know the organic driven distribution of people does 2 things (unintelligible) we know part of the concern that some (unintelligible). Are there some intervention methods that work where you could provide a little relief without (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: Well we're talking about rest rotation right now

Tim Aldrich: Yeah

Michael Bias: And you guys keep asking us and we keep telling you on (unintelligible) the challenges with some of these various aspects and you take a 50 mile river and jam it into 30 you're not going to relieve crowding.

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: That's good that's why we're here. Understand this stuff.

Jim Slattery: I think there's only 1 alternative that we don't want is the rest and rotation.

Michael Bias: That's a good point, most of a lot of them are

Jim Slattery: We don't want it so

Michael Bias: only if you want to float between the lakes

Scott Vollmer: Maybe that's something that we can start out with

Michael Bias: I know a great spot to stop and get out and have lunch.

Mike Mitchell: So the other question who needs a bladder and or a brain break. Let's get back together at 10 after 3.

COMMITTEE ON BREAK

Mike Mitchell: Okay, so here's what I would propose for the rest of the day. We have public comment at 4:30 and I would suggest we continue our discussions where we left off but let's keep an eye on the clock because in 1 hour I'd like to discuss with the group about next steps. What do you guys want to do? So the conversations that have been going on are really important. I don't want to shorten them at all but let's be efficient with the time as best we can. Any questions on that? Okay so where did we leave off? Mark

Mark Odegard: I'd like comment about something Tim said about displacing people. Sort of like the problem of Africa you got a lot of people dying of starvation there. The problem is we can't really solve the problem because there's too many people and I think we just, for some

people there's too many people on the river. It's going to be that way from now on out and it's going to get worse. I've done some analysis of climate change in the area, we're looking to have some really rapid growth in population.

Mike Mitchell: So I heard people, but where we left off does the group want any more discussion on that topic.

Michael Bias: Yeah, I think the answers yes. We have 8 alternatives and 1 of them mentions rest and rotation. We have 8 alternative and some of them mention not capping SRP's is there, I don't know is there a way to put rest and rotation to bed or are we just going to keep dredging it up or that's my question?

Jim Slattery: I can live without it.

Lauren Wittorp: To me it's more of a holistic approach. The reason I think I agree with removing it when you put Don's idea if it reduces use so then you wouldn't need something like that so I'm not comfortable with saying no we don't need it all because then what if there's not another, if there's no reduction in use or cap on anything then I think something like that could still be needed.

Michael Bias: So like a maintaining rest and rotation as an option depending on the other ones we incorporate.

Don Skaar: Right

Lauren Wittorp: Right the same with SR removing the cap on SRP's I'm only in favor of that if there's, I was in favor of it because of the implementations that Don proposed.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: I'm not clear on alright why don't you just tell us what you can't live with?

Lauren Wittorp: Based on these alternatives?

Michael Bias: Based on coming up with a plan we can't live with

Mike Mitchell: I'm sorry was that can with or without a (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: you cannot live with that right

Lauren Wittorp: Okay

Michael Bias: Well I don't know that's probably not the approach but we've mentioned several things already that you can't live with them. And so as far as negotiate around those and so I'm just flat out asking you which ones can't you live with.

Lauren Wittorp: Okay, I can't live with a plan that monetizes days or permits or entry would require (unintelligible) so that's something I can't live with.

Michael Bias: Why isn't that one of our objectives?

Lauren Wittorp: So one of

Mike Mitchell: Let me step in here a little bit. I don't want personal challenges going on. There's nothing wrong with saying

Michael Bias: Well let me ask you then if we can't live with monetizing commercial user SRP's why didn't we come up with that as an objective?

Mike Mitchell: We can put it on there as an objective.

Michael Bias: Or why, well I don't know what the other ones were.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah, no there's nothing wrong with getting to this point and saying we're missing something and putting it up there. Nothing wrong with that at all.

Jim Slattery: Well in number 1 it's in there.

Lauren Wittorp: I mean to me I just measured that myself and I looked at maximizing commercial users to me that I like how I considered that in my values when I was maximizing things so it's always been a part of how I looked at everything.

Michael Bias: Okay

Lauren Wittorp: I'm not opposed to making it an objective. I wasn't saying that but I am opposed to their not being a, I want there to be a cap. I think there's been a lot of ways proposed that can work as far as it doesn't monetize, that's fine. I can't live with there not being a walk wade section.

Michael Bias: But you already said it has to be (unintelligible).

Lauren Wittorp: I did not say it had to be both I said I was willing, if the upper was walk wade the lower could not be. I wasn't willing to look at them separately is what I said.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: Step in again, rather than talking about what's unacceptable let's throw some ideas out there that are acceptable from your point of view and then let's talk about finding a common acceptability okay. So let's have no lines in the sand. There's a difference between negotiation and debate and so I'd like to go back to what are the other substantive issues so somebody help me.

Mark Odegard: I would like to comment on this came from day 1 I said don't like it because it's a daily thing. It's very complicated. It confuses people. It's (unintelligible). It's got all kinds of (unintelligible). I would propose throwing it out and if we get down to a point where we can't live without it then bring it back.

Mike Mitchell: So that raises a really good question where what you keep in the alternatives, what are you evaluate and what do you toss out. If you had all possible combinations of all of these ideas we'd probably have about 47 of them that we'd have to thin through. Coming up with, okay we don't need to spend any more time on that is perfectly fine but if there are folks in the group that say no we need to then what we need to do is fold them into some alternatives that we can put on the screen and discuss and negotiate specifically about a particular item, not abstract. So Mark you basically proposed what?

Mark Odegard: That we take rest and rotation off the table.

Mike Mitchell: Okay so do you folks want to take rest and rotation off the table?

Jim Slattery: I can live without it.

Mike Mitchell: Okay that's a good way to put it. Can you live without it?

SOME MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE SAYING YES

Lauren Wittorp: I still think I'm at no.

Mike Mitchell: Okay well let's keep it on there and we'll see how it plays out. There's nothing wrong with seeing if that makes a difference. Do we have any other ideas based on our discussion about what we can toss out, stop talking about or what we still need to consider going forward with our alternatives?

Melissa Glaser: Can I just ask Tim, Tim did alternative 7 with the rest and rotation why you went with that system as a better system than not being allocation wise? Is there a reason why you chose that in (unintelligible)

Tim Aldrich: It doesn't give the allocation thing and I think allocation is kind of a final step you know in saying we don't have any other tools that will distribute the use. (unintelligible) use and quality of use. I think you know I look at the Bitterroot very much the same problems that we're dealing with right here. There were social issues you know that group was able to come up with some ideas how they could provide, thought they could provide some relief you know (unintelligible) their rotation experience (unintelligible) on the river. They finding that you know that it needs some tweaks and then came back and gave the outfitters some things that they needed but I think at this point in time they still say they don't need to (unintelligible) allocations (unintelligible). I think it's as you look as the (unintelligible) rules as

Mark said you know you find out how we look at that allocation (unintelligible) not the first steps (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Tim how long has that section been on the Bitterroot that's rest and rotated. I mean it's important (unintelligible). We need to dispel or

Tim Aldrich: I think we were rationing river use in 12.11.435 where that starts.

Michael Bias: So (unintelligible)

Scott Vollmer: Here it is, got it right here. (unintelligible) to Apple Berry is 11 miles, Apple Berry to Trapper Creek is 8 miles. Trapper Creek to (unintelligible) is 8 miles, (unintelligible) to (unintelligible) is 9 miles. (unintelligible) is 19, 19 to (unintelligible) is 27, and 36.

COMMITTEE TALKING REALLY QUIETLY CAN'T

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: Friday, Saturday and Sunday

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible) get to float 11 miles or 8 miles or (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING REALLY QUIETLY CAN'T

Michael Bias: changed it to launches so you could launch to (unintelligible). It's 26 outfitters in the upper half and there's 52 or 53 (unintelligible). That's (unintelligible) so from Apple Berry down is wide open to the public.

Julie Eaton: Gotcha so that is very different.

COMMITTEE TALKING REALLY QUIETLY CAN'T

Julie Eaton: yeah it's not an overlay to the Madison. I gotcha

Michael Bias: And it's primarily in that West Fork section

Scott Vollmer: The end is just below where they come back together correct? It's been a number of years since I've fished (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: But Tim that system seems like it overlays on the Madison (unintelligible)

Tim Aldrich: It does, I think it follows the where you start out in terms of (unintelligible) allocation of use

Julie Eaton: let's ignore that let's just talk about the rest and rotation.

Tim Aldrich: That river I think the average is about 60 feet in width and it's got significant difference in flows from June to (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: But you still think that, that's an equal application to do rest and rotation on the Madison and the Bitterroot the same?

Tim Aldrich: I didn't say that.

Michael Bias: But time there's now there's no opportunity (unintelligible)

Tim Aldrich: It's really (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: There's not it's closed.

Julie Eaton: I was just trying to define how that informed, must because it's an option no that it actually works the same

COMMITTEE TALKING REALLY QUIETLY CAN'T

Tim Aldrich: in the rule which is what basically we are (unintelligible) that's kind of the guide line we look at as policy

Julie Eaton: So regardless of the reality of it

Tim Aldrich: No reality takes over

Julie Eaton: That's true, I looking at

Don Skaar: Well after the 1st year did you hear any complaints about that? On the Bitterroot.

Michael Bias: They just had a public hearing over (unintelligible) boats to launch yes. And they were (unintelligible) the complaints were very similar if you close your eyes you thought you were on the Madison (unintelligible)

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible) changes you know (unintelligible) gave them, gave outfitters a chance to not have to count 2 trips with one float, or launch (unintelligible) high water time get through those reach is pretty dang fast (unintelligible) before it was really tough to take 2 boats or 2 trips to 1 float (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Mike how did that get through?

Michael Bias: How did it get through?

Julie Eaton: Yeah how did that get agreed upon when you know that (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: do the same thing, very similar (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: oh don't point at me

Tim Aldrich: that group (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: Their process was way longer, a year wasn't it a longer time frame?

Mike Mitchell: Well so we met a total of 5 times, I forget how much, so it was 2 days and then there was an interval, I forget how long that was, 3 weeks and then they wanted to get back together for 1 day and that was 2 or 3 weeks later and then the modifications that you're talking about wasn't me. That took place at some point later and I don't have a clue.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Tim Aldrich: 16 people came together (unintelligible) done some good things and some people are going to complain and they outfitters gain and few things people lost and there're always going to be that in play in reality (unintelligible) commercial service provider more (unintelligible).

Melissa Glaser: If you don't do, if you don't look at a rest and rotation what do you think is the next way of capping commercial use?

Tim Aldrich: Well I think I can (unintelligible) I guess I find there's no magic here. There are people that think they're to (unintelligible) trying to do the same thing at the same time at the same place. And it's not a factor of how many outfitters we have or SRP's permits. It's a matter of people, the number of people using the river at one time. (unintelligible) their experience as they define it you know at the (unintelligible) it's difficult and how you do that spatial separation you know and which is what we're talking about right now or temporal or just (unintelligible) when that's where you get into some of the alternatives we haven't even spent a lot of time talking about today but they're on the table. (unintelligible) see where that goes. I have no thoughts about (unintelligible) this group is (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: Yeah that would be something that I would have, I think it would be ideal to see what the area alternative deal at least if nothing else deal in terms of the growth issue. Maybe if there isn't a cap then at least contemplate what you're going to do about it. Maybe that should be some alternative you know what is the breaking point. What amount of change is going to be too much. I think everyone would agree it's going to happen at some point. Everyone's going to be a little different I think that would be useful. I just don't want to, us to just keep building bigger parking lots and more access sites and then eventually one day go geez, no one's having any fun here so that's kind of a crazy alternative just building out more rather than deciding when enough is enough so I think you know we had a few alternatives that address that but not all of them. Not most of them.

Michael Bias: One of the common experience I saw was leaving Grey Cliffs to the confluence to the Jefferson status quo (unintelligible). I'm looking at it from (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: I was putting together a paper on (unintelligible). The April rule talked about it being (unintelligible). I've not seen to many areas where (unintelligible).

Julie Eaton: So status quo.

Mark Odegard: I mean I think the primitive part is probably below Warm Springs (unintelligible) and I don't see why you're eliminating 1% of the users. Why they can't go there.

Michael Bias: Less than 1

Mark Odegard: Yeah

Mike Mitchell: So would you say what you're proposing again Mike?

Michael Bias: We're saying that (unintelligible) the alternatives throw that out and leave it at status quo (unintelligible) to that.

Lauren Wittorp: I think I would want would want to go back to I think it's a holistic approach when FWP proposed that Cheryl told me numerous times she thought that was important and so that's, I think you would have to look at it as an overall thing not just 1 line item. I think everything has to be looked at more holistically than individual things.

Mark Odegard: Just to add to that Cheryl's not here but that came out of the past history. The past CAC recommendation was to maintain that as a primitive area.

Michael Bias: Maintaining it as a primitive area is not the same as keeping commercial use off (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: And you guys can address on how to do that but the idea was maintain the status quo if that's what primitive is but trying to take away (unintelligible) that change. So that's the main (unintelligible) to keep it (unintelligible) how do you do that.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Lauren Wittorp: And like I would say again I agree yesterday that if there was an overall cap and it was reducing things that way then we wouldn't need something like that but without having a way of addressing capping then I can't agree to getting rid of that but if like say we went with like Don or Charlotte's idea then I could say yes get rid of that because I think it would address that side of it of keeping it that way. I don't think I can pick and choose without other parts of it.

Mark Odegard: The April plan trying to build on the past CAC effort (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: Sorry it really (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: Whoever has the land there it's private land. And are you going to tell the people they can't build houses there?

Mark Odegard: (unintelligible) more of a fishing access, where are we going to build more access points, where are we going to improve access points, (unintelligible) it's those types of activity (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: Why is the Committee arguing (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: What you're talking about is limiting access.

Michael Bias: Yeah I think we need to focus in the Committee right now.

Mark Odegard: Calling it primitive to me is a misnomer.

Mike Mitchell: Mike when you said keep it in the Committee did you

Michael Bias: Well Mark was discussing issues of primitive (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: Okay so

Michael Bias: I'm fine with that but if we start doing that we might as well talk to Jason and (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: I think that's a fair point Mike.

Mark Odegard: (unintelligible) problems with primitive was (unintelligible) in April and understand how you could call primitive when probably 60% of the land is private, people can do whatever they want there basically and will continue to get more and more people (unintelligible).

Mike Mitchell: Okay so I kind of lost the bubble on that conversation. Maybe it's because it's 3:40 but that discussion was going towards what action needs considered.

Julie Eaton: Improving on something.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: and it's a hard balance so we've got to find something else on that one.

Mike Mitchell: What we were talking about agreeing

Julie Eaton: Sorry just trying to

Mike Mitchell: Yeah I'm just trying to say what we were talking about

Julie Eaton: What about glass (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: Commercial use, Mike it was commercial use from Grey Cliffs to the Jefferson

Mike Mitchell: Okay alright thanks. Julie what did you say?

Julie Eaton: Glass, will that work with the other one? Can we agree on glass?

Jim Slattery: Just say no to glass.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible) objective, alternatives but I don't think that's going to do anything as to what the actual problem is.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: Snatch victory from the jaws of defeat. I was thinking about this you know the low hanging fruit and grabbing the easy wins and all that stuff and this process is designed to bring about difficult conversations that haven't happened or need to happen or what have you so even if you start talking about something that is low hanging fruit, difficult stuff has a center of gravity. It just sucks you over there so but you know to the extent that necessary but difficult conversations are happening that's, that is actually, it's an uncomfortable and difficult way to put it. You look like you want to say something.

Melissa Glaser: I really do I want to present something into Sarah that she can type out (unintelligible) to see what (unintelligible).

Mike Mitchell: Are there other things within the alternatives that we haven't considered that we need to consider in going forward? So I've heard a couple of people say well we haven't talked about the fish. So what is (unintelligible)

Tim Aldrich: I'd like to talk about alternative (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: yeah I think it was 6

Tim Aldrich: I think that enough (unintelligible) deserves discussion.

Don Skaar: So what would you like me to do?

Tim Aldrich: Well I guess I just believe that this address the issues that brought us here.

Don Skaar: Yeah well on 5 the center piece of 5 is the cap on total use and that's looking forward. It's kind of a forward looking alternative. Reducing further displacement, reducing further crowding. Kind of intentionally was designed not to get into the business of the commercial operations, how that's done or any of the SRP permitting, any of that. Intentionally done that way. I do understand that's unpopular from the stand point of doing away with the number of non-resident days would there's going to be economic consequences because they're spending more than a resident for sure. I don't know how to finesse that other than that, I'm pretty sure that the commercial user days which is mostly non-residents certainly fit within that 100,000 angler days. Of course if the point was to make sure that commercial users got their slice of that then that would be a whole different discussion how to manage that. But I do think that 100,000 angler days is certainly more than all the commercial activity going on now so there's room for commercial and non-commercial use there. So Lauren kind of talked a little bit about the other parts of that. This kind of was designed by controlling growth that we'd be able to do away with future, the crowding getting worse or the displacement getting worse so that's why we took out the rest rotation stuff to kind of as a I guess giving something there, the idea that that wouldn't be as important if we're controlling that growth. And then the walk wade was sort of a I guess sort of envisioned as sort of a compromise there by having odd even days for wading and fishing.

Mark Odegard: Comment

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mark Odegard: Get an analysis of what I would (unintelligible) this year user days based on the (unintelligible) we're seeing and it would be this year my prediction is we'll fine 223,000 user days for 2018.

Don Skaar: We can base it on the use whatever time we started the thing. That was sort of just based on last year's numbers roughly.

Mark Odegard: (unintelligible) back to (unintelligible) and take away 10% for growth.

Michael Bias: And those numbers vary so if it's 70%, 70% of 200,000 (unintelligible) so you would right off the bat you're cutting 40 what 40,000 non-residents out of the picture. So when we were having our discussion it was like if this (unintelligible) alternative let's first get a number on, an idea of what that number is. Give anyone that wants to fish the Madison a permit, end of the year count them, you know what you got. How many of those were non-residents so you're already starting (unintelligible) to your monitoring and evaluation and then from that number set crowding, was it to crowded, was it to this, what it to that, everybody gets (unintelligible) and then maybe you can start ratcheting it down. That's how is with SRP number is, let's first put the system in, see how many there are, we've got all these great numbers and then we start manipulating, we start managing that fiscal use, but based on the numbers we have (unintelligible) non-resident at least is over 150,000 and you're also asking to

measure angler days which measuring angler days is kind of following someone around. You got to do it (unintelligible), so how are you rendering the days across when the distribution system is a licensed (unintelligible) Charlotte's talking about where you buy a 10 day license to get a 10 day Madison user permit. You buy a season license you get a 365 day a year permit (unintelligible). Now to implement that system you evaluate how (unintelligible) actually fished (unintelligible) after the season evaluation and then you got a system like the SRP where you're you know Joe Schmo from Vermont has 87 days and so he gets 87 days next year. (unintelligible) and manage 150,000 (unintelligible) SRP's days on (unintelligible). I don't know just how far you want it to go. Those are the questions I have on a system like that.

Don Skaar: Yeah what I had in mind is we estimate number of days fishing per angler and dish out that many permits for year 1 you know say we think every non-residents fishing 3 and ½ days something like that s owe issue 30,000 permits. But we don't know how it's really going to shape up, we'd have to measure that after that year or the next year something like that and then adjust.

Michael Bias: That's not a giant administrative burden on Fish, Wildlife, and Parks and (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: Well it's not as much as some of these other alternatives. I mean yeah

Michael Bias: Really

Don Skaar: I think

Michael Bias: Which alternative

Mike Mitchell: Hold on a sec let's just go with what Don's saying again we don't want to debate it.

Don Skaar: I don't think there's any doubt that just about anything we do here is going to have some more administrative burden so I guess the question is, is it worth it? You'd probably say so.

Michael Bias: I think it might be yeah. You know you issue (unintelligible) tags it's not for 3 days, it's to the end of the season right so I was thinking along the tag lines that they get their license and apply for a Madison tag, that allows them to fish the Madison (unintelligible) a random survey and they ask you how many days (unintelligible) and so then the challenge is out of those 200,000 how many individuals is that (unintelligible) that 200,000 it could be 1 guy fishing 10 days or 10 guys fishing 1 day.

Scott Vollmer: That's a huge challenge is, let's go with a base line of 3, you can go with 5 to make the math easier, you know average days is 5 so you end up with 20,000 non-resident permits let's say 30,000 there's no cap on SRP's so a lot of those are going to be go to

individuals who are non-residents fishing with outfitters and while some of them will be a day or 2 days here and there what's they keep 1 individual or many individuals from saying woohoo I just one the lottery I'm going to spend 3 weeks fishing on the Madison with a bunch of days well out stripping that 3 day average (unintelligible) you say more, and more, and more see what I'm saying. There's no way you can really keep track of yeah we're going with the hours because that's what the numbers say but it doesn't mean that's what the people are going to do.

Don Skaar: No I mean you'd know after the fact.

Scott Vollmer: After the fact.

Michael Bias: Enforcement, just like on the stream enforcement for us (unintelligible) for us it's easy we have our permit we have our tags we have everything right there if you get check, life jackets, dah dah dah, for some dude walking below Three Dollar Bridge where's your permit for today. I think if we go that season type tag. It's certainly doable.

Don Skaar: I mean the other alternative is what was in alternative 7 you know base that on a commercial non-commercial bridge rather than resident non-resident. It's still getting to the same point just through a couple, parceling out the groups a little differently.

Michael Bias: You only manage users on (unintelligible)

RECORDING IS VERY POOR CAN'T UNDERSTAND

Michael Bias: the objective or the management technique of managing all use on the Madison is overwhelming to me.

Don Skaar: No you're totally right and I'm not saying this is the right plan but I do know it's going to get to a point where people are going to turn around and why didn't we do something about this 10 years ago.

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) this doesn't even incorporate the lower river. Oh I'm just, (unintelligible), uh this is Three Dollar Bridge, (unintelligible) 30 miles away. But it doesn't address any of the lower river stuff correct?

Don Skaar: Yeah, it could be part of our new alternative

Scott Vollmer: in my opinion we haven't talked about that not nearly enough, we need to talk about that more. I don't know what could be done. (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: I had a question about (unintelligible) I'm not sure we (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: No he has (unintelligible)

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible) up there just for fun. So I guess I was just trying to incorporate some of the things that people were talking about with your value in days which

(unintelligible) allocations so drop that out by adding Tim's launch thing with the max of 5 trips, you're average to get the commercial cap that I think they're looking for as well as the capping of the SRP's which they're looking for and that as far as the walk wade sections I left them in there as status quo but opened up that section after it becomes un-wade able basically to floating from or fishing from your vessel in the upper Three Dollar Bridge or Pine Butte open to fishing from vessel. And then add a resident day (unintelligible) so it's really the only changes that I made from alternative 4 but I think it (unintelligible) I think maybe it helps some of the (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: The idea of using trips per outfitter per day per launch is extremely cumbersome. For one it's a obtainable metric in other words we know when we launched last year and how many times we did it but to assess, what do you do with the guy who did (unintelligible) last year and now he's down to .03 launches per day from whatever the dates are. I don't understand how that manages distribution of days across the year. It's an artificial way to say oh, we don't want allocation so what are we going to come up with trips per day per outfitter per year. It's a very cumbersome metric that is going to be difficult to enforce and hard to keep track of as an outfitter. I'm doing very few trips. Some of these guys running hundreds of trips. And then why does he get 10 a day I get 5 or I get 3 or I get 2, or how is, explain to me how that manages the distribution across Lyon's to Ennis.

Tim Aldrich: I think when you look at purpose and needs statement

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Tim Aldrich: No Mike listen to me for a change.

Michael Bias: Okay

Tim Aldrich: I think the purpose and needs statement is really clear it's not trying to reduce the use it's trying to retain use at the level it's at. It's kind of a rating scale if you will to say hey let's take a better look, bigger look, let's (unintelligible) we're attempting to do exactly that.

Michael Bias: I understand that and how does it do that. Explain to me the mechanism for how it does that with 200 outfitters.

Tim Aldrich: Well you know I, well I added which was the 5 and 10 (unintelligible) if you have fewer than 5 or 10 you average out over the last 2 years so there's a lot of those outfitters that have a very low number. They wouldn't get 5 or 10. There's some of the people, I know some of the people I talked to (unintelligible) she said this would hurt on the upper end but I plan some days to launch more than 10 (unintelligible). It would, you would never know what it does until it does it. You can kick the data and you can make the best possible estimate based on (unintelligible) of having all the data (unintelligible). And again it was, this was probably the

thing that broke the bank with the, back in April a year ago is the fact that this was one of the big supposed players (unintelligible). This was just a modification of that saying okay let's see what happens if we do this.

Michael Bias: But has there been any work on any kind of modeling, predictability, we did it with the 25, 50, no one's even look at how does 5 trips per outfitter, per day, (unintelligible) on the river, (unintelligible)

Tim Aldrich: No I agree.

Michael Bias: And it was thrown out in April for a reason, it was rejected in April for a reason and we keep bringing it back.

Melissa Glaser: (unintelligible)

Tim Aldrich: It was rejected because of the mathematics that's out there (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: And so how is this going to be any different other than it's based on an average, say that it's 120 days long and I did 10 trips I get .12 trips per day.

Tim Aldrich: Mike if (unintelligible) in the numbers (unintelligible) when you realized there were 150 outfitters that didn't come close to 10 (unintelligible) so that goes back and that is in there but what was left out for people to play with mathematically you still had almost 200 outfitters that could (unintelligible) far beyond what we had today (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: My point on that is trips per outfitters per day is not a metric that is commonly management trips by. It's (unintelligible) 5 trips next week, it's not launches per day so.

Tim Aldrich: Again you're talking about (unintelligible) reaches, several reaches on the river (unintelligible) that carry (unintelligible) basically in that June, July and August. That is the heaviest use by far and (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: Right I understand

Tim Aldrich: if there's social conflict

Michael Bias: How does this address that 3,000 outfitted trips from June? How does this drop that, does it drop it by 50%, I don't see how the average trips through the year affects that (unintelligible) I'm not seeing it. And I ask and no one can explain it to me and no one has yet explained to me. Fish, Wildlife, and Parks hasn't explained it. How does average number of trips per year, launches per day change that distribution?

(unintelligible)

Michael Bias: I don't know, I didn't come up with this (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: Tim so bringing Mike's point up here so how are you going to quantify the average? Is that like if a guide goes once a day for 10 days between October 1st and June 15th does that mean he averaged 1 a day, I'm just throwing that question out, I'm asking, I need to get potentially 250 days between October and June 15th only once a day. It's a little unclear there or are you taking the average, he had 10 trips in 250 days then he gets .02 trips a day, you see what I'm saying that metric doesn't quite work out very well. And then the same thing with the average days in the season where he gets, you know some days he has 10 days and then some days he has 1 day you combine all those numbers together and then say all right you had let's say it's 100 days and you had 150 trips so you get 1.5 trips a day I mean how does that work out. Or is it well it looks like the average that you use per day you had 1 day at 5 and then 1 day at 10 but the average is going to be 7 so you get 7 trips a day for that time. I think that's where it's kind of sticking here.

Tim Aldrich: Jim I just try to respond to that this part was trying to stay even no add to what's already going on there so the average of those people who are under 5 or under 10 the average would be very close to the (unintelligible) have currently.

Jim Slattery: Okay so if they had 10 days then that's what they would get.

Tim Aldrich: That the average would (unintelligible) no more than a day or two whatever that might be they would keep it what it actually again that's consistent with the purpose and needs statement.

Jim Slattery: Okay

Tim Aldrich: Level off don't let it go this way, don't try and make it go this way.

Jim Slattery: Yeah

Tim Aldrich: The other side of that, that would need to be explored and I talked to Julie about this today is you know you got to look and see what this does to (unintelligible) and then you need to be mitigated (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: You get bonus for the days I only have 1 boat out you know what I'm saying

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: I don't see how it works

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: I don't see how mathematically it works. I don't

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: Because if you have 1 day

Tim Aldrich: You would get what you had the average of the last 2 years.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: per day but so if you had 10, I'll make it easy if you had 1 day, you had 10 days you had 1 trip but then 1 day you had 10 do you

Tim Aldrich: yes

Jim Slattery: is that 20 trips and then you average it out for those days?

Tim Aldrich: (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: so it would be 2 a day

Tim Aldrich: well the average over the entire period of June 15th to September 30th

Jim Slattery: Alright so then what happens if you only have 80 days in 100 day time frame do you get .3 trips or do you get no trips a day

Tim Aldrich: I think you'd have to round (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: So if you do that, so by that a guy that 30 trips now has 100 so that doesn't work mathematically it does not work.

Scott Vollmer: Here's on the opposite end of Julie here's my question is and this happens a lot myself and colleagues of mine to straight years and the only thing you do for 2 years is (unintelligible) that's it so in the case of this the average is going to be 1 correct? 1 so but I'm not worried about me personally as far as business wise but if I get a 2 boat float if I got a group of 4 and then next year and I'm at 1 I got to take them to Yellowstone so that's moving stuff somewhere else.

Michael Bias: Just the number of

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Julie Eaton: It's the number of boats under your license

Jim Slattery: Under your license

Julie Eaton: On any day

Michael Bias: Ah dude

Julie Eaton: Exactly so

Michael Bias: Why can't we just do the number of days?

Julie Eaton: Because they want it organic, this is an organic this is boom, organic is different

Michael Bias: I don't understand it.

Tim Aldrich: that's fine (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: That means on days you do zero to bad so actually if they evaluate every year, you're going to ratcheting down if you don't use all your (unintelligible) is that the idea?

Michael Bias: I did 30 days last year how does that affect me going into this year.

Jim Slattery: You get .3 days so then he's going to average it out to 1 day so now you got 100.

Michael Bias: 100 what?

Jim Slattery: 100 trips because you did 30 he's going to average it out to 1 day, it averages out to 1 trip a day at .3 so now you went from 30 to 115 or whatever days that (unintelligible) so you're actually

Julie Eaton: So I call you

Jim Slattery: compounding it

Julie Eaton: call you to give you my business because I can't do it under this.

Michael Bias: I still don't understand but now your checked by a ranger for whatever days how is this enforced?

Julie Eaton: when we turn it in and they

Tim Aldrich: How a lot of things are enforced you know (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: No me as an outfitter how am I going to know where I'm at?

Jim Slattery: You'll have 1 trip a day instead of so you'll have the potential of 100 or how many days you're of the (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: (unintelligible) and this year I can do 100 so

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: Or if you did it between October 1st and June 15th how many days that is I'm going to throw out a number of 250 now you have 250 days.

Michael Bias: How does that distribution we're trying to flatten out it's now (**can't recreate sound**) by 250.

Julie Eaton: So a few people get decreased.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: How is the decrease part?

Julie Eaton: You're only allowed 10

Jim Slattery: If you averaged let's say the whole (unintelligible) season you averaged 13 trips a day now you're only going to get 10.

Julie Eaton: And it doesn't matter, some day (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: So what affect does that have on distribution?

Julie Eaton: Some of the people does it really help your saying?

Michael Bias: No because it's per day. You could do 14 boats in one day but now you can do 10 across the whole season.

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: I'm going to average the 14

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: So I went from 14 boats a couple days this year and next year I can do 10 boats a day for 120 days.

Jim Slattery: No you have to average 14 boats every day.

Michael Bias: And nobody's done that (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: But I'm just saying.

Michael Bias: But I'm just saying this is not based on anything

Jim Slattery: It actually propounds the issue.

Michael Bias: It's not based in, we never measured trips per day per outfitter ever in the history of SRP and we never measured anybody's enforcement or launching or anything dealing with commercial use by average trips per outfitter per day at (unintelligible) and now you're implementing that not only that you're saying we're going to calculate that, take your average and that's what you get for next year (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: But you get more days

Mike Mitchell: Let me step in here. Mel thanks for actually modifying an alternative so we can put it on the screen and talk about it. I'm curious are we going where you were thinking with your modifications.

Melissa Glaser: In a certain way. I wanted to really nail down, I don't know what's going to happen after this meeting. It's 4:15, we don't have anything on the books, there's a Commission meeting at the end of April (unintelligible) pushed to next year. I don't know so I just wanted to nail down a really important thing that might be put into a plan.

(unintelligible)

Melissa Glaser: Yeah we could talk about I think we discussed implementation

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Melissa Glaser: Tim's alternative so what are the mechanisms to manage commercial use are there maybe it's just capping SRP's then it doesn't do anything for total use of the river but maybe that's all you do to start and see where that takes you along with the evaluation (unintelligible) of what we put up having this potential alternative, besides education and a use permit and evaluating it after year 1 to see where we are and getting more solid numbers on the non-commercial use. So I don't know, I was trying do

Jim Slattery: Trying to get something done right?

Melissa Glaser: We've got 15 minutes until public comment and I don't think we're going to (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: We were never going to, we were told that we could decide right?

Jim Slattery: yeah

Julie Eaton: We were told that we needed to come up with something to present and if it doesn't get where (unintelligible) then we have to do something different. We weren't told that it just ends.

Don Skaar: Yeah I see it as we can continue if we think it's useful

Julie Eaton: We just started being useful.

Don Skaar: Yeah or we can issue something collectively or separately

Melissa Glaser: I also think there's (unintelligible) the consequences (unintelligible) if we don't do anything (unintelligible) SRP permits this year. I know any commercial outfitter out there is going to be increasing their use as much as possible in case they do get allocated so there's things that will happen (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: that's kind of why I suggested that earlier that what are the outfitters plans because if there's a cap so that we can figure out what you guys want and then we came up with it looks like we have a tier plan, we have capping all use plan, we have a no capping plan, and then we have the Michigan plan. It could be our recommendation that we, the river for commercial outfitters need to be capped and these are suggestions that maybe you can look at and then have a separate Committee that's filled with outfitters and you guys has it out with FWP what you guys want. I think that's a viable solution.

Julie Eaton: What do we do Jim that's like when we go with the 10% what do we do with everything else because (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: And then okay, I knew that was coming then at that point you cap, how I would see it is that you cap the use, all use at the 2018 number and you parcel it out the way it is. If it's 70% non-residents then they get 70% of the day and the residents get 30% that's traditional. That's traditional since 1982 and then if you need to if there's room to add for residents then maybe you add a little bit more for the residents. You add some days for them if everything kind of works out.

Julie Eaton: So we're just getting to the negotiating part and now we're just going to say

Jim Slattery: Well it's just an idea because we're running out of time and if we want to present something that's a way to do it so that the outfitters maybe that are on this Committee and maybe a couple more that have an interest in it, they can sit down with FWP and hash out what they want to do in regards to capping the use. Because we've all agreed that we think it needs to be capped. All uses need to be capped. It seems like a fair way because I don't feel comfortable deciding on your future on how your business is going to be run. I don't feel comfortable about it. I have my ideas how I think it should be but I don't feel comfortable telling you what to do.

Mike Mitchell: So let me step in here because we're limited on time and I'm sorry to cut the conversation short. So the group needs to decide how to go forward and it's up to the group. I'll tell you my perspective having watched everything for the past 6 times we've gotten together. I recall that (unintelligible) diagram I put up earlier that show where structured decision making conflict resolution and fact finding fall out. This is over in that part of the diagram where it's conflict resolution and fact finding because there's a lot of discussion about what the facts are. A lot of discussion, conflicts between shared values. Believe it or not you've been negotiating for 6 meetings. It's a different kind of negotiation than you have seen before.

The rubber hits the road negotiations became real after you look at the decision analysis and it focuses on those things that really need to be talked about so I'm hearing different conversations than I heard at the start. There's a whole lot of stuff the Committee isn't talking about that probably doesn't need to be talked about. I think my suggestion going forward. Structured Decision Making is not designed to deal with full no conflict resolution and joint fact finding. There's always a part of it involved and so I think it kind of comes back on to the Committee. Today was full of tough discussions. I'm hearing more criticism than I'm hearing creation. So my question to the Committee on going forward is can we continue these discussions and get to a point where we are creating something that people can live with? Instead of saying no that won't work and that's not to say, there's no value judgment there I'm just asking you do you see an opportunity to come together on an alternative that people can live with or are we in conflict resolution and joint fact finding. Do we need to take a different approach? With that Committee this is your call.

Melissa Glaser: Can we take out those last 2 bullet points under Commercial use and see where that takes us?

Lauren Wittorp: I mean I can say I'm not going to agree to that if that is your asking.

Melissa Glaser: Even those SRP permits are capped?

Lauren Wittorp: Are we just talking about rule 2 I mean we can't even read the rest of it so are we just talking about rule 2 because if we're talking about rule 1 then no and I don't think, I'm not going to say yes to this if that's what you're asking.

Michael Bias: So no for rule 1

Lauren Wittorp: Correct

Michael Bias: What about 2?

Lauren Wittorp: I think I said multiple times today no. I mean it creates value and I've said I wouldn't agree to that.

Mark Odegard: (unintelligible)

Lauren Wittorp: Yeah I've said multiple times I agreed with, my alternative is Don's system, Charlotte's system.

Michael Bias: So that puts this back and that's it.

Lauren Wittorp: I'm mean I'm sure there's, I'm saying of the things currently proposed those are the 2 I would agree to.

Melissa Glaser: I can't agree with (unintelligible) there's no way, that's just going to affect (unintelligible) there's too much that I don't know what it looks like. If I knew after a year or 2 of looking at use permits for non-residents and looking at that and we see those growing like crazy but I can see how we could change it at that point with that cap on growth but because we're managing for a social conflict and people continue coming to the river there's not that much social conflict and people have been coming (unintelligible) so I can't (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: Lauren out of all these meetings and all these alternatives in this giant matrix the only ones you can live with are Don or Charlotte's plan? There's no

Lauren Wittorp: I mean I asked questions earlier about another way of days (unintelligible) I said the Michigan, (unintelligible) the Michigan idea you know days, the State own days and they weren't placed on an SRP, an SRP is where I'm limited, I said something along those lines I would agree to. I mean I just think

Michael Bias: So there are portions in all the other alternatives we can continue to work with that you might work towards. I'm hearing that forget it, we might as well just forget it because there's nothing we come up with that you would agree with but if that's not the case then let's keep going and (unintelligible) work on (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: Remember our application says that we were to work together in good faith and you know, I haven't, I hear good things but to come up with some (unintelligible) right today is I don't know, it's not negotiating, we're not all, I don't know, I don't want to just throw it out all this time. I'm not okay with that. I believe in this (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: I can tell you if we don't get something done here at least from the Department's stand point we aren't going to go back and petition the Commission to do something in April. If the group thinks there is still something to be done that we can collectively then that's what we want.

Julie Eaton: Right that's what I thought.

Don Skaar: So, yeah, that's really what we want.

Michael Bias: Well that's what I want. I want to keep, we come this far (unintelligible), get something out.

Julie Eaton: We just got to (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: Lauren you know kind of taking back my idea here would you feel comfortable with the outfitters and FWP making their own self-determination or how they would handle the cap?

Lauren Wittorp: I think that's up to not just outfitters and FWP I think the public has a say, I know people make money off the public resource and I don't think just the people doing that

should make their own rules. I think that's like letting bankers make banking regulations. Other people have say in how those policies are made that are in that industry and I think it's a public resource and everyone should have their say on that.

Jim Slattery: So you're sticking point essentially is you don't want to monetize days and you would like to see growth an entrance for new outfitters.

Lauren Wittorp: Correct.

Don Skaar: Could you question then be phrased to be, you're just talking about outfitters and FWP coming up with the idea I mean that's not the end of it but having kind of a sub group to

Jim Slattery: Well I was yes

Don Skaar: try to get it to the bigger Committee?

Jim Slattery: Yeah well I was kind of thinking about handing it off because, I know people laugh but I feel that it's their decision but I take what Lauren's saying to heart as well. But at the end of the day I wouldn't want somebody come into my business and tell me how to do it.

Mark Odegard: We're past looking at it so I don't think we can just hand it off.

Jim Slattery: Right, that's true too.

Michael Bias: I think we're getting there it's really the first afternoon of discussions.

Jim Slattery: Well you know if we take Lauren into consideration the Michigan plan. What is that? What does that look like? Why don't we explore that and what's wrong with it and maybe is there something that we can do to find some sort of compromise with it. Just throwing that out. We've gone through the tier plan, we've gone through the capping all use plan, and obviously the no capping is nothing so why don't we discuss the Michigan plan.

Michael Bias: For the Michigan model is essentially the tier plan except the State holds the days. The SRP doesn't have those days attached to it other than it's (unintelligible) buy us 30 days and then I'm done outfitting at 30 days and my permit is transferable to someone else and does those 30 days go in a pool or my successor and those days are lotteryed or somehow given to someone coming in as an opportunity (unintelligible) based on, it could be 5 days and those 30 (unintelligible) 60 outfitters. But if all those days and all the SRP's you set (unintelligible) are accounted for then at that point there's no opportunity for entry unless someone goes 2 years in a row or turns in or retires their permit.

Jim Slattery: The days are owned by the State. So let me ask

Mike Mitchell: We got 1 minute

Jim Slattery: Let me ask 1 quick question then how does the Committee feel about, can you live without monetizing days?

Michael Bias: As soon as you put any kind of, right now it's unlimited and you make it finite, cap or limit or cap the days that becomes a value to other outfitters that want it. There's only 22,000 outfitter days on the Madison.

Jim Slattery: So then the Michigan plan doesn't have, so it monetizes the days just the State

Michael Bias: No it monetizes the permits so

Jim Slattery: Monetizes the permit.

Michael Bias: And some and that's you know that's through the market that's like oil leases or something. But it allows people access to those permits and there's a lottery or application process access to those days. But really once it was based on 200 outfitters and there's only 22,000 user days right now so the only way to allow for new entry is to make that larger otherwise it's already full right? See what I'm saying.

Jim Slattery: So it essentially it monetizes the days though. It does. Even though it's the SRP but it monetizes the days.

Michael Bias: It monetizes it by the fact that it just restrict it, so it's not unlimited anymore.

Lauren Wittorp: So Jim if you want Michigan then tell me the only way they thought to make that their way better is to make their permits unlimited and the days owned by the State that way so new people can get in and apply for the days. The system would have to be done differently in terms of their not tied to a name.

Jim Slattery: Okay so in other words it wouldn't control, it wouldn't cap use, uh commercial use

Lauren Wittorp: Yes it would so there would still only be 11,000 days available to as many outfitters as that wanted them. There would be first come. They said theirs ways to make a system where days can become available at different times throughout the year and anybody would have an opportunity to have those days.

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible) discussion than what was (unintelligible), there's a lot to that one.

Jim Slattery: We maybe should have explored this a little earlier instead of

Tim Aldrich: I guess I really think that (unintelligible) we're still trying to gather a lot of information, we still have some disputes that basically that are not resolved how we work around it from my own perspective I still think about social conflicts and I'm not sure we've ever really gotten into conversation (unintelligible) tools (unintelligible) even think about seriously (unintelligible) social conflicts. I'm not sure (unintelligible) in that process.

Julie Eaton: So you're wanting, your bottom line is what?

Tim Aldrich: I'm not sure we used the right process (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: So Mike is firing himself and we so

Jim Slattery: Where do we go from here?

Julie Eaton: Like this group we have lots of information you just want to say

Charlotte Cleveland: Mike were you suggesting conflict resolution as opposed to this kind of rulemaking?

Mike Mitchell: Yeah I mean that's another again if you want to keep the group together and continue you this process, if you see some light at the end of the tunnel where we can arrive at something that approaches consensus if you can't you can keep the group together and go through a conflict resolution process or if you want a fact finding process or any of the things that you can think about. So it's totally on you. What I was going to suggest is I can send an e-mail out sorry for (unintelligible) in your time, I can send an e-mail out that says do you see any prospect of finding a consensus option based on what you've heard so far? Should we go forward? Second thing is how do you want to go forward? Do you want to go forward with the current process Structured Decision Making which honestly is really stretched to its limits right now given the discussions were having. But it's possible that this could still work out as long as people in the room see potential for a consensus solution. I can ask you those 2 questions, you tell me what you think and then the group can decide how to go forward from there.

Charlotte Cleveland: Would you describe conflict resolution to us?

Mike Mitchell: I have no expertise in that.

Scott Vollmer: Can you give us your opinion on where you think the group should head?

Mike Mitchell: I, all of these I've done this is clearly the toughest. This one is pushing conflict resolution more than I've seen before and so the way I know that is usually when we get to this point and it's not a conflict resolution situation it's an easier discussion to talk about this, or this, or this, or this, if we're having in depth discussions that really don't have anything to do with the alternatives or tangentially you're not talking about a specific alternative. That's usually a good indicator that SDM is stretched. So that doesn't mean it's broken but whether it is or not what do you guys as a Committee see value in continuing the process or saying we're

not getting the job done with that we need to try something else. That's your call. That's my take on it.

Julie Eaton: Well all I can say is that really (unintelligible) if we do e-mail and not have one person torpedo all this time so we need to not, in my opinion not let myself or anyone because this was stuff has been learned (unintelligible).

Mike Mitchell: You want to what?

Julie Eaton: I've learned a lot of stuff and I want to use it and I don't want 1 person to tell me my time was wasted that we've been doing (unintelligible) 1 person (unintelligible).

Don Skaar: Are you saying the decision to move forward would be a majority vote is that what you're?

Julie Eaton: We can decide what majority is but yeah I don't want 1 person to give away all this time we've spent on learning from you so I've had a little bit of hard time of voting, not that it was just 1 person but I'm just saying I don't want that to happen.

Mike Mitchell: So how do you guys want to weigh in as a group so respond to the entire group with your answer to those 2 questions or

Julie Eaton: Put your head down on the table.

Michael Bias: I think we've made a lot of progress I think it's resolvable. I need to understand some of the alternatives (unintelligible) it's on me I'll work on that (unintelligible)

Mark Odegard: As I've said before I've seen these things but this is probably the most complicated thing you're ever going to see. So it's going to take more work than what we've put in.

Michael Bias: Really some of these alternatives we've only seen in the last 2 hours. We've only really explored the 10 or 15 across the page in the last 20 minutes and I'm fine with that. I understand where the traps and pitfalls that Lauren wants to avoid and that problem that Don wants to avoid. We're getting there.

Mike Mitchell: So should I send that e-mail out and everybody reply all with the results? I'm sorry

Michael Bias: I don't need an e-mail I'll tell you right now (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: You guys want to decide now about going forward or not or do you want to think about it? Okay how do you, so do you want to have a vote on it? Formal vote?

Lauren Wittorp: Can I ask one more question just to Tim? What's the Commissions I know (unintelligible) the Board of Commissions and getting regulations for 2020.

Tim Aldrich: Well I think that's what we intended at the Commission (unintelligible). I just I don't there's no way where we are at right now.

Julie Eaton: What she said we want to do it right not necessarily fast. So it would be nice (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: are we really going to be able to come up with a solution?

Scott Vollmer: That's the question mark.

Mike Mitchell: You guys have invested a lot of time and for my point of view you've made a phenomenal amount of progress. I mean my hats off to all of you, you really have a tough, tough process but that's deciding about getting on board and investing more time I think it comes down to that first question. Do people see a prospect a faint glimmer of hope that we could arise at a consensus solution or is that just not possible? That's what I would say in that first question.

Julie Eaton: There's good stuff on this chart.

Michael Bias: I think we can solutions to (unintelligible) talk about and others, the details on some of the others might need to be left to the Commission or other (unintelligible). We can get to the point where, I think we almost go to it today on the SRP cap, capping SRP's or not. Depending on where we go. The details on Don and Charlotte's alternatives I think we can certainly narrow it down and get the areas that are more (unintelligible)

Julie Eaton: And remember the things that's in our description of Negotiated Rule Making we just can't live with it we can't go with it and here's why (unintelligible) let's (unintelligible) it's okay.

Jim Slattery: I see the capping all use as an alternative, that seems like the most viable alternative then how do we track that how do we, do we gut the economy? I mean to me that's my biggest problem with that I see 60 50 % non-resident users you're gutting the economy. That's just I (unintelligible) with that.

Julie Eaton: And then that's (unintelligible) you say specifically that's my heartburn with this (unintelligible) my numbers (unintelligible) figures that (unintelligible) negotiated rule making (unintelligible) asked us to do.

Jim Slattery: I think the numbers for non-residents should be historical use or someplace near there.

Mike Mitchell: So that would let's put that in an alternative. If you guys want to continue?

Michael Bias: I think Don's alright with that right?

Don Skaar: What he just said

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Michael Bias: We've got to identify historical use first.

Jim Slattery: It's in here already.

Don Skaar: Well let's just say I'm willing to talk about something different than what I put out there.

Jim Slattery: It's in here, in here it says 75% plus or minus 5.

Mark Odegard: Depends on which way you look (unintelligible)

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: Let's come back to those 2 questions. Do you want to answer them now or by e-mail.

Julie Eaton: Now

Jim Slattery: Now I vote now

Mike Mitchell: And you want to vote on them, what do you want that vote to look like?

Jim Slattery: I think it's got to be unanimous.

Mike Mitchell: Consensus, unanimous that something can still be done move forward.

Lauren Wittorp: Are we talking about, I'm all about continuing talking how much longer is there a, are we going to let this go on for a year or 2 years or is there 2 more meetings or what does that look like so right now like if we don't have consensus on anything what if we go through 2 more meetings and eventually we'd have to say, like if we can't come up with something not this.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Don Skaar: I do think we'll probably know

Julie Eaton: (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mark Odegard: And then I suspect 1 more meeting.

Don Skaar: Tell us

Jim Slattery: that's all I can give, that's all I can give.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah is there, you know the process takes as long as the process takes until you do it, you really don't necessarily know so I couldn't tell you how long it would take to actually get through a consensus solution (unintelligible) together.

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Mike Mitchell: I mean it really is does the Committee want to fish or cut bait. Do I need to explain fishing or baiting? Okay so anyway is it worth your time to go forward and perhaps find out that no we're still, we're not going to get anywhere or is it worth your time to go forward and say we have a shot.

Jim Slattery: I say let's go forward. I think we're going to have to use Don and Charlotte's method of capping use I think that's where, let's all go home and work on that in our brains and come back and see if we can come to some sort of agreement. We spent the time.

Mike Mitchell: So

Jim Slattery: that's my 2 cents.

Mike Mitchell: anything about, anything else about voting.

Lauren Wittorp: Don you're going to do a poll, is there a time that people can meet again before the next Commission meeting?

Don Skaar: Actually the one plan we could, Mike wasn't going to be there but sounds like Mike is well that's the question is what do we do about a facilitator.

Mike Mitchell: Fire the one you got. Let's start there. No and I apologize people this is really important but we've had vacation plans for 6 months, deposits have been put down, not much I can do about it so, yeah so, I'm the fly in the ointment on that one now alternative dates if the ones that Don sent out (unintelligible) just won't work.

Don Skaar: Well the one that did work is April 9th. And alternatively if we're going forward I'd just put another poll out that would have to be sometime after April 20th is that?

Jim Slattery: I'm leaving on the 23rd. I guess I could do it. (unintelligible) When are you going to be gone if I may ask?

Mike Mitchell: I'm leaving the 9th coming back the 20th.

Julie Eaton: the 20th doesn't mean that we can get something in so if you don't have to we can do that but understand that yeah I mean

Jim Slattery: Is everyone booked up next week I mean is that what the problem is?

Don Skaar: yeah, I mean I don't have it in front of me but there's multiple people that weren't able to make it. I mean I can sent that out we could try again.

Jim Slattery: I mean is that a hard fast, with everybody for next week that those who have commitments they have to do them or could they put them off?

Julie Eaton: So you're saying meet without

Jim Slattery: Well he would be here.

Mike Mitchell: I'd have to look at my calendar

COMMITTEE TALKING AT ONCE

Jim Slattery: He's going to be gone the 9th so you have things going on next week as well

Mike Mitchell: Oh yeah we're coming toward the end of the semester so I've got (unintelligible) graduate students (unintelligible) things like that so I'd be more than happy to try to figure out a way to make it work.

Jim Slattery: We just got to find a way.

Don Skaar: Well in that case I'd ask people to go back into that poll, if you can still find the e-mail and see if you can squeeze out any more days than what you had in there and

Charlotte Cleveland: and then get back in touch with you

Don Skaar: Yeah, Mike will look at it too.

Mike Mitchell: Yeah, I (unintelligible) it again.

Julie Eaton: I told you guys I'm (unintelligible) a surgery issue in Colorado my daughter is (unintelligible)

Don Skaar: But that's after the 11th ?

Julie Eaton: Yeah

Don Skaar: Okay

Mike Mitchell: Do we need a vote?

Tim Aldrich: What was this vote for 1 more meeting and then (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: You will show up for 1 more meeting. It is consensus.

Don Skaar: Sarah didn't vote.

Mike Mitchell: Okay

Scott Vollmer: Don is there a possibility you can send us that link for the poll mines long gone.

Don Skaar: Yeah

Mike Mitchell: Do you want to make a decision now about continuing the SDM process or taking a different approach (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: I think we can make this work personally, we just go to resolve or find a way to make everybody live with everything.

Don Skaar: We've got a lot invested in you too.

Mike Mitchell: Not sure everybody's happy about that. I don't know it's up to you. Because I do SDM not conflict resolution and joint fact finding I'm at the boundary of my end as long as people understand that. I'm happy to show up again. But my facilitation is not necessarily going to help out with some of the issue that I've been (unintelligible) I'm willing to give it ago. I'll do my best but I'm going to keep trying to pull it back to what are our alternatives or consequences and if I can't do that then I'm pretty limited in what I'm going to be able to do for you. You want to think on that and get back or do you want to figure it out now?

Melissa Glaser: Who said April 9th is the only day that we can meet (unintelligible)

Mike Mitchell: I think I said that

Jim Slattery: I'm you've given us really good ground rules. We might be able to go about it without it. Might, we might need a referee though. We won't need a referee.

Scott Vollmer: There's plenty of uniform law enforcement officers (unintelligible)

Jim Slattery: True enough, you've given us a great foundation about how to go about doing this. We've been civil.

Don Skaar: Is everyone still good with looking at the calendars again and see if we can get anything to work first?

COMMITTEE SAYING YES

Tim Aldrich: I don't think we want to start over.

COMMITTEE SAYING NO AND I AGREE

Jim Slattery: I think we're close like Mike said. We kind of have a path forward now we kind of know what people can't live with but there's an avenue to get there a resolution so let's give that a shot.

Mike Mitchell: Okay well if I'm not here, here's my prediction, it'll take you an hour (unintelligible). But I totally agree with what you're saying Jim you don't necessarily need somebody to help you through the rest of this process but I'm happy to help if you want.

Jim Slattery: Well if you're available we want

Mike Mitchell: So we'll do the polling and if your slacker facilitator can actually show up then we'll continue the process until we just feel like we can't continue anymore.

Jim Slattery: We'll get done, he's talking negatively

COMMITTEE TALKING AT SAME TIME

Mike Mitchell: Okay, alright a lot got done today, thanks guys that was believe it or not as tough as it was a lot got done today. Thank you very much. What's that? Yeah, yeah

Travis Horton: Well time for the public comment, I think everybody knows the drill. How many people are interested in commenting? Alright well we'll go for ½ hour you got 3 minutes a piece is what we're going to do. We'll go to 5:30 or so (unintelligible) so go ahead and come up I'll let you know when you've got about, we'll have to stick to 3 minutes to get out of here so I'll let you know when you get real close to that 3 minute mark. Don is that recorder still on?

Don Skaar: Yep

Todd France: First of all I think you guys are selling yourself short on how far you came in one day today. I thought sitting back there is today is the first day that I've seen you guys really get down to some nuts and bolts and it's nobody's fault. I think it was the process as Mike had mentioned. And this truly is a nuts and bolts situation that we have to go through if there's any success to be had on this management plan. For you guys to deliver to Fish, Wildlife, and Parks. Again don't sell yourself short this means a lot and I think that it was underestimated, highly underestimated exactly what a lot is and that's why it's taking so much longer, so much harder because it should be hard. I mean take a lot at what this means to everybody. This isn't a meeting we come together for 4 or 5 meetings and be able to come up with some plan, this affects not only my entire community, my livelihood, Julie's livelihood, Joe Dilschneider livelihood, Brian's livelihood, my mom's livelihood at the liquor store if you remember that one. As well as possibly the whole rest of the State of Montana as we've said this is quite possibly the ground word for the management that we're going to see on the entire rest of the State of Montana. Correct me if I'm wrong on that. But I think it's been said enough to where we all feel that way and I just hate to see you guys go through this much effort and it be turned over to

the agency without my voice being heard through you people. And I would implore you to please keep that in mind and think this thing out because there's a lot of good solutions. If there's this few people that can change their mind a little bit on a few things, this doesn't have to take (unintelligible) that much, just a little bit. I think you guys can do it. So good luck to you, my hearts with you.

Brian Rosenberg: Hi guys, just wanted to again commend you for the efforts it's a hard day but a good day digging into some of the details. I would like to recommend that don't get overwhelmed with trying to get into the minutia of the details. Remember ultimately Region 3 of FWP will write the plan so what's more important is you produce some higher level guidance as a recommendation so you know we know now like what are some of the big sticky points it's should there be boats in the wade areas, capping is important how should that be done. Rest and rotation was discussed. I think it is important related to capping that we separate commercial guided users from non-guided simply because we have so much information on guided client guided users and we have a lot of tools that are very easy to put in place. I think it is important to address all users but it's little more of an untried system so I would recommend let's set a commercial cap now, let's also put in place where a trial period of a stamp system or a you know general user system can see how it plays out. Maybe there's no cap initially so you see how that you know how manageable is that, how feasible is that. Through that you'll also gain revenue as well as more finite statistics. And then in 2 years you come back and maybe you have confidence that, that plan could be an encompassing plan but at least you take low hanging fruit which is capping commercial use. That's ready now. In terms of capping commercial use I think again don't get, you know just set some guidelines. I agree that what are the priorities there we do need to first and foremost stop this curve so you set a limit. You also prioritize how does someone get (unintelligible) it is important for our industry that new blood can come in in 10 more years so we do need to minimize barriers to entry as best as possible. If you cap the system then it is not as easy to start guiding as it is now and there's no restrictions, that's a fact of life. But we do want to pay attention to that, we do want to minimize that through that process and there are ways to do that simply those recommendations are all you need to send on. No one here in the room is experts at that process so let FWP go out and look at systems and let them come up with those, the details of that but you provide the guidelines and the sort of skeleton. Let them put the meat on the bones. I think to Don's plan there are a lot of questions that need to be answered how those get doled out, in Oregon there have been runs on those because you know for a couple bucks people buy lots of them so there are a lot of questions. It's the only idea I've heard outside of like a turnstile that actually somehow address the much more complicated you know unguided use, which is an important one. I do like the idea one of the topics, one of the big concerns in that upper wade area is if you remove boats you lose access to a lot of water. I would encourage you to look at the Blackfoot in our own State where they have a recreation management plan where all the landowners came together and allowed a 50 foot easement from the high water mark to allow walk in access so if you're going to remove boats on certain days of the week on those days where you can't use a boat you got to have some legal way to access that

river and there's precedence for that on the Blackfoot and I believe also on the Missouri between Wolf Creek and Craig so I think (unintelligible) thanks very much.

Unidentified Speaker: Hi everybody thanks for all this effort. I've been here every day and this is like one of the first days we really, people really got to the meat of stuff and it was controversial and I was thinking a lot in the background. I do want you to think about we're pushing so hard on what are currently written as a wade only sections and I think what you need to do is think of something in your plan that will help educate everybody to communicate more about the other places you can wade. Like people come in our shop and they're like it is so crowded at Three Dollar Bridge because it's Saturday. Where can we go? Um and we're like well go over to Ruby, go over to here, go over to here we have like 10 other places we can send them and I think in this group we need to figure out an education process to help people learn and tell people where else they can go. On a education note on excise tax it is paid by a lot of residents. We pay excise tax, we are a manufacturer and we pay it on the flies we bring in, we pay it on the rods we manufacture, we have to pay 10% of the sales price of the product that we sell and that goes to that 50% that helps here. So since fishing products is paying excise tax so there is a large amount of residents who are paying that. There is another note to think about as well um, there's a lot of thought going in to saying I don't want to monetary value on this it cannot happen. But you have to reconsider this because you've already set a precedent with the SRP process. You currently have people that of many years of paying fees that included 3% of their guide revenue towards that permitting process so they have a lot of years of investment. So if you determine as of this moment they cannot have a monetary value then you are discriminating that the old seasoned users who paid a lot in get nothing and the new users get a freebie. So you have to think about those and the aspect of when you design a system if you are so focused on non-monetary don't be discriminating to only one soul. Understand that people have made an investment in their lives and it included money not just shoulders, rotator cuffs, and other parts of bodies. Thank you for the effort.

Jay Taylor: My name is Jay Taylor with Rocket Shuttles we're the largest shuttle business on the upper Madison. We shuttle thousands of vehicles from April through November. We're up and down the 45 mile stretch from Reynolds to Ennis Lake for 210 straight days from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. most days. I would guess that we shuttle approximately 70% of the vehicles on the upper Madison and we employ 12 seasonal workers. I would be glad to share all the numbers of where the fisherman are launching and taking out at with the Committee. The one thing we are seeing daily on the upper Madison is that almost everyone wants to fish from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. Very few are fishing from 6 a.m. to 10 a.m. and from 4 p.m. till dark. In my opinion there's plenty of room for everyone if the people were more educated to this fact. The river is wide open in early morning and afternoons. Please get ahold of me if you'd like to have more numbers on what's going on from Reynolds to Lyon's. Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: So I want to talk to you guys real quick about a small percentage of the population that uses the upper Madison and that is of the non-profit sector. Specifically Warriors

and Quiet Waters and the Veteran population. Shutting down the walk wade sections would have a negative impact on the local non-profit organizations and their participants. Having to tell a participant, of Warriors and Quiet Waters that he or she can't fish historic waters of the upper Madison because they can't affectively physically walk long wade sections of rivers prevents us from fulfilling our mission statement and is a direct contradiction of our communities values of inclusivity. The proposed rest and rotation plan would bottle neck anglers and crowd sections of the river and take away from the serenity and solitude we aim to provide to these combat veterans. Capping outfitter days would discourage outfitters from allowing their guides the opportunity to guide for our participants because they would be forced to forfeit profits and they would be putting them toward Warriors and Quiet Waters participants. I respectfully disagree with these proposed changes and urge the Committee to be mindful of the ramifications of their final decisions and as a 2 time combat veteran myself I can attest to what Warriors and Quiet Waters is doing. I mean I would urge you to keep them in mind while you're making decision. So thank you.

Tyler ? : How's it going? My names Tyler ? I actually come to you from a concluded public opinion. I have no intention of ever guiding on that river at all. (unintelligible) specifically so this would kind of suck (unintelligible). But more importantly like when you go to those spots the people are around to have rafts they just kind of line up on the (unintelligible) on that section. Because all the people I talk to, I work in a fly shop, (unintelligible), I've worked in a fly shop for the last 5 years and everybody wants to go at Three Dollar Bridge or Raynolds Pass, that's what everybody talks about or Raynolds Pass or Valley Garden. That's what everybody talks about you know talk to me from Illinois, Chicago, New York, and they already know about that area. Those 2 areas specifically. And it really doesn't matter you know what I've seen is someone in that area they just came thousands and thousands of miles to fish they're going to fish where they want to fish and where they read about fishing. So it's not in my position to try and send them somewhere else as far as I can see is to get them to spread out as best as they can so they enjoy that water. Done that a lot of times either involves taking a guide trip or getting a buddy in town to get you on a boat to get you a little bit further away. If you take that away it's just kind of obvious to me that I'm just going to have to walk slowly behind people bank side for a mile and a half and try to get to open water and get to where I want to go. I'm 32 and I can pretty much where ever I want (unintelligible) most of my life so (unintelligible) don't scare me about falling down. But a lot of the folks that I see out in this crowd here today and the people that come into my shop on a daily basis aren't as comfortable wading in those areas. So you're going to do 1 of 2 things. You're going to just promote them to trespass on the way to the spot they're going because they can't get there and especially down in an area like Valley Garden where generally when I get far enough down I'm one of the few people that's in the water because you can get a little more heated (unintelligible) and in that area you're just going to promote just tons, and tons, and tons of trespassing. It's going to bother more and more people or you're going to get people walking through boulders just to get a little further down the bottle neck situation you guys talk about is a very real thing.

So if you go to both those 2 parking lots any day of the summer, they're just jammed packed and you said that you can spread them out and I wish I could, I honestly do but they're going to go where they want to go and they're going to fish the way they want to fish. When they come from their distance or the people that live in the area and just love the areas they fish so much. So my take away with any use by boat is just really going to condense those areas. You find the boats ramps just insane. And the people that do make it further down because it's much easier to walk down stream are just going to get back on shore and walk up on someone else's property a little bit more regularly and that's all I have to say about it. Thank you for taking your time to listen. Have a good day.

Travis Horton: Anybody else?

Brian Elsberg My names Brian Elsberg Ennis resident. Thank you guys for doing what you did today. It seemed like the most progress we've seen in 6 days. Thank you for continuing I'm with Mr. Aldrige on this one where do it right don't do it quick. Even if it goes past April 20th right, there's another meeting, Commission meeting June or July, there's going to be one in October. We're, it seemed like it was so close right, most of this Committee has been willing to work together and listen to each other and it's like right there right. So I say kudos to you for continuing to do this. I still fear like a lot of people that access to that upper wade section is going to come down to trespassing or not trespassing so I still think boats up there is just so critical to that and if it's, if we want a wade only section let's (unintelligible), let's make town to the lake the wade only section because high water mark exists. It actually exists down there right. There's no high water mark in that Big Bend area so you can't get in there without trespassing. I just feel like that's such a scary thing. I'm more scared about that today than I've been through the entire process right and for me Montana means access and if we're setting a precedent for removal of access to me it's just this is a Nationwide shot right. Everyone's going to hear this. And if we go down the road that Wyoming's going down, Colorado's going down, it is just scary. I didn't come here for that. I came here because I had the ability to access water. And to me that's most important. You can take away my job, I'll flip burgers, I'll pound nails I'll do whatever I have to do but when the access to me (unintelligible) taken away or that the thought of it being taken away it just is so scary. Something to think about I, as a small outfitter, I'm with Aldrige on the average day like 5 or under, or 10 or under, we have to (unintelligible) Mike Bias's graphs right if I can do 100 days in the spring I don't automatically go to 15 days to 100. Those clients just don't exist and all those flat lines that's all us and organic growth which is very tiny right. So it would take me my entire career to fill those days which will just never really happen so when we think about ideas that do increase SRP users days or their ability to guide more especially that 185 users, that 185 SRP users I don't think we need to be freaked out because we're not going to be here right. We're not going to instantly be on that other side. We're likely not to get out of that single flat plane or very much so I think it's okay to look at that and implement something like that without fear of all of a sudden there's you know 60,000 guides in April or something. It's not going to happen. And those usage graphs sort of prove

that so don't be afraid to give a little extra to everybody. It's not going to get used up right away. It's just not so thank you, thank you for doing the job.

Ben Bulis: My name is Ben Bulis the President and CEO of the American Fly Fishing Trade Association. We're based here in Bozeman Montana but we have members all across the country. One thing that was just said recently and I'm going to apologize for pointing but there's 71,000 people employed in the outdoor industry in Montana and they make their living off of public resource so the public resource does have a value to each and every one of you in this room. And then you go beyond that and you think about how many factors across the country who rely on Southwest Montana and the retail shops not just in Ennis but in Bozeman and West Yellowstone, Big Sky. I mean this is a huge economic driver that if there's something that is negatively done to limit access in this area it's going to have a ripple effect across this country. The other thing that I would say as a resident of Montana it's hard to cap, it's hard to tell people that you can't go somewhere with a boat and fish or walk wade in areas. So my recommendation of living in 26 years in Bozeman or Southwest Montana is why not have a permit or cap or tag that you can buy for the walk wade section on the upper Madison. Because my child who is now 12 can't walk those sections but he loves to fish them. So we go down in the boat and we get out and walk and the other side of it to is that the outfitters and guides are the stewards of the resource. They're the ones who care, I shouldn't say the most but they're the ones that are out there every day. And if there's conflict in those areas let's figure out a way to limit the public in those areas and I hate to say that but if it's the public who is the conflict in that area let's look at that section because I don't think it's the guides and the outfitters. Thank you.

Dan Larson: I wasn't going to say anything but I'm Dan Larson with Madison Valley ranch but following on a couple of these comments I was struck by an article I happen to just pick up today. It's out of the Spring issue of Distinctly Montana and it's an interview with David Brooks the Executive Director of Montana Trout Unlimited. Which is probably the premier cold water fisheries conservation organization in the country. And unsolicited but here's the quote from David Brooks. The angling and outdoor recreation industry are keenly aware of how their economic futures depend on caring for the health of trout and trout streams. And there have been some editorials in the paper recently that kind of impugn the motives of some of the people that are in this room or different interests there and here's the leading conservation organization saying that most keenly interested in the care and health of trout and trout streams. (unintelligible) so thank you very much. You're all Montanans you know that it's coldest and darkest right before the dawn in negotiations and that's what I've done my career. You guys are in that predawn period. You've made a lot of progress, I really encourage you to hang in there and see the light. Thanks.

Eric ?: I'm Eric ?, I'm a guide and outfitter and most importantly I'm a resident, Montana resident who loves public lands and loves our access and I've been floating the wade sections for years and I do bring my clients in there from time to time but really I really love fishing that zone with my family and friends and whether it's the white water you know kind of

technical rowing in the upper section or the wildlife and scenery down the channels it's floating through those sections really is something you can't find anywhere else. It's truly a special experiences and I do believe that public access is the heart beat of Montana and once you start privatizing or putting severe restrictions on public access you are setting a dangerous precedent there. And that precedent can be transferred over to other activities, snowmobiling, mountain biking, hiking, climbing, you know a lot of other activities that really make Montana what it is today. And I do agree that the river is getting busy but I believe you can make a compromise and I know this isn't an easy decision so I just encourage you to really find a compromise in a decision that does not entirely eliminate floating in the wade sections.

Travis Horton: Anyone else?

Matt: Hi my name's Matt and this is my daughter Wendy. We're against the elimination or restricting boats in the wade area sections. I know eliminating boat access will make it access nearly impossible for young families, elderly, and people with disabilities. Wendy started floated in the wade sections when she was 5 days old. We have a lot of good memories about that and those section are great because I can kind of cherry pick the holes. (unintelligible) where I know there's lots of fish especially down by the big bend area. We just love being out there seeing all the wildlife, the flowers, the birds migrating, it's a great educational opportunity for our family. It also allows anglers to spread out instead of being congested here in the parking areas. If there's an angler on one side of the river I can use my boat to cross to the other side of the river, have an area to fish for myself. I can float down river if it's a busy day, find an area that isn't busy and have the river to ourselves and have a picnic. It also allows river bank vegetation, eliminates vegetation being trampled, eliminates trespass issues, your just saving Madison (unintelligible) preserve the river bank, people stomping around the river bank. It also allowing full size boats and allows (unintelligible) to go do. (unintelligible) float down the boat in her little boat. She's, people need experience people on the oars, get them down the river safely. So eliminating or restricting boat access will essentially privatize large sections of the current wade section only because of private land. The best water I think is the Big Bend River downstream of Three Dollar Bridge. It's nearly impossible to reach this area without assistance of boats. Eliminating boats from this area only benefit a few landowners and the Madison River Foundation Board Members. All (unintelligible) limiting public access for everyone else. I'd like to thank you for public access in this room for representing us. Thanks.

Travis Horton: Anybody else?

Justin Edge: Justin Edge, guide outfitter, resident Ennis angler (unintelligible) first let me say I really appreciate your willingness to move forward. You've all invested so much time in this. So I appreciate continuing. Kudos for that. A lot of discussions today have focused around commercial use and I keep going back to that graph that Mike Bias provided with the red line, it's down here. And a lot of discussions focus around you know us as a commercial users

and I appreciate that and I'm, I appreciate that Mike, Scott, Julie I'm really thankful for the outfitters that we have on this Committee because I feel like they're participating in good faith effort. Making a lot of concessions, offering a lot of discussion about the concessions that we're willing to make but I've seen no contribution or concessions being made or real meaningful discussions about what the public side can concede or what their willing to negotiate or you know and that includes myself as a resident angler. You know I fish the Madison myself almost on a daily basis (unintelligible) by myself or with my family so I know that any impacts or any regulations on the public is going to affect me too. But there needs to be some equitable discussion here. And the whole Row vs Wade discussion is totally baffling to me because the entire river is open to wade and I wade at Raynolds, I wade at Valley Garden, I wade at Three Dollar, but as a boating angler I'm restricted to a certain reach of river and so any more restrictions on access via boat seems completely unequal to the wade angler with respect to wade anglers. That's all I have. Thank you again and we'll see you next time.

Mark Odegard: All right any body else. Going once, twice, (unintelligible)

Michael Bias: We have 2 more minutes.

PEOPLE TALKING AT ONCE

Unidentified Speaker: I just want you guys to also know that you can please some of them and but you can't please all of them all of the time. I'm going to take the stage real quick.

PEOPLE TALKING AT ONCE

Unidentified Speaker: And the recorders gone too so I can say what I really want to. Honestly I would love to go back to 1976 as I know you would too. I know Don and some of you others that have been here all your life. And the ones of you that didn't get to be there in 1976 I would love to take you back and show you what it was like in 1976. But we're not going to be able to go back in time. We're not going to be able to set the clock back. All we can do is take advantage of making sure that this still great river that we have stays just that, a great river. And again I just, I want you guys to be successful in this but just keep in mind we can't go back in time and if we have to make concessions then golly for the sake of just getting something good done for the majority of the group that everybody can live with instead of having Fish, Wildlife, and Parks who knows a lot. They don't know everything. They don't know how outfitters function on a daily basis. They don't know the correlation between the landowners at the (unintelligible) west branch and general public or the landowners. They don't know every day that what we see out there if we decide that we're going to guide up on the upper stretch of the Madison. So use the input that we've been given a chance to use to help Fish, Wildlife, and Parks do it right and get it right. And if it takes 2 meetings maybe we think about going 2 more meetings but there's a lot of really important issues resting for everybody on this and I just, I'd like to see be successful. I went more than just a little bit sorry.

Mike Mitchell: All right well thank you everybody. I don't know how to inform you of the next meeting date.

Don Skaar: We've been doing press release.

Travis Horton; We'll do it through a press release so, there you go.

MEETING ADJORNED